

CRIME AND RELIGION

BY JOSEPH McCABE

PUBLISHED BY

PROGRESSIVE WORLD

CLIFTON, NEW JERSEY

1954

CRIME AND RELIGION

BY JOSEPH McCABE

**PUBLISHED BY
PROGRESSIVE WORLD
CLIFTON, NEW JERSEY**

1954

PREFACE

This work is an exact, factual statement of the proportion of Roman Catholics in the criminal population. It is extracted from the official criminal statistics of a score of nations in America and Europe. It does not argue what influence Roman Catholic education ought or ought not to have on social behaviour. It tells, in official language, what influence it *has*. It contrasts the ratio of crime in the few remaining solidly-Catholic countries with that in solidly-Protestant countries and in Communist countries, which the Church affects to despise. In mixed countries it compares the Catholic and the non-Catholic shares of the criminal population, paying particular attention to juvenile delinquency. And it shows that there is not a single exception to the law that Catholic education in every country produces the largest share, in proportion to the size of the Catholic body, of the criminal and delinquent population.

In an age like ours, in which the Roman Church has been allowed, if not encouraged, to recover a remarkable degree of political power in the pretext that it is, as it claims to be, a valuable agency for checking crime and constructing a high social character, it would seem that such an inquiry is a primary and most urgent duty of our sociologists, social psychologists, and criminologists. You will find, however, that there is no other book in any language that makes this analysis of the statistics. In Dorothy Culver's large compilation of a ten-year (1927-37) crop of literature about crime, *Bibliography of Crime and Criminal Justice* (1934-9), published by the University of California, this vital question of Religion and Crime occupies only half a column out of 700 columns, and in the list it names only one small American work; and that work contains only a few figures about American prisoners. In all the rest of modern literature you will find only a small work, in Dutch, of local character. Neither work is available today, and there is no copy of either in the British National Library, the largest in the world. Such is the blackmailing power over our education and our press that we have granted the Roman Church on the fraudulent pretence that it checks crime and promotes character.

The analysis further shows that the most effective social agency in this respect is purely secular education. How many of our educationists and sociologists dare embark upon an enquiry that leads to such a conclusion? I note with pleasure that a few American sociologists do quote a few figures, and sometimes they expressly disallow the Catholic claim. The majority of them, however, act like the distinguished British authority, Sir Cyril Burt, who in his *Juvenile Delinquency* (1938) speaks with respect of the "profound potentialities" of religious education and does not quote a single one out of the hundreds of available statistics which show how in point of fact it works.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I The Church's Criminal Past	1
II Crime and Corruption in America	7
III In the Cities of Britain	16
IV Crime in the British Commonwealth	21
V The Crime Record of the Irish	28
VI The Remarkable Lesson of France	34
VII The Record of Catholic Countries	42
VIII The Record of Protestant Countries	51
IX Beyond the Iron Curtain	56

CHAPTER I

The Church's Criminal Past

The few Catholic apologists who notice any of the ugly facts which I give in this work display all the resourcefulness of their craft. Until the present century such apologists begged their readers to judge the Church, not by the colonies of Catholics in Protestant countries, but by the free, warm expansion of its spirit in Catholic lands. When the few folk of the last century who could afford to travel in Italy, Spain, or Portugal returned with lurid stories of vice and the use of the knife, the apologists urged them to make an allowance for "the hot blood of the south." If one pointed out that even in Ireland and Poland the statistics of vice and violence were worse than in England and Scotland, the apologist pretended that the poverty of the Irish and the Poles explained this; as if he had not to explain *why* they remained so poor, or *why* a poor man, even with the advantage of a Catholic education and living in an atmosphere that was free from the taint of heresy, was more prone than others to resort to such crimes as assault and rape. Moreover, the Catholic farmers of South Holland and Bavaria are at least as prosperous as those of Norway and Sweden, yet have a much worse record of crime.

This more immoral condition of Catholic countries is, of course, just the Catholic past lingering in sheltered areas. Our historians are intimidated from telling the truth about the moral conditions of what Catholic writers gushingly call the Ages of Faith, just as our sociologists and criminologists are afraid to draw public attention to the statistics today. In recent years there has been in America a singular crop of large, elegant and finely-illustrated histories of Europe and of the Middle Ages. In my *History's Greatest Liars*—I may say that I am not responsible for this heavy title—I showed that nine out of ten of the professors of history who wrote these works gravely misrepresented the character that Europe had while it was under the domination of the Church of Rome. They did this by a scandalous, and often total, suppression of the uglier facts and by making general statements of a flattering nature on the strength of minority-facts and Catholic fiction. I must, therefore, begin with a few observations on the real character of these mediaeval folk, of which I trust to publish an adequate account with full authorities later, and the way in which their blatant vices lingered in Southern Europe when our modern secular civilization had reduced them elsewhere.

The truth is that the cream of the Catholic Era, from the second half of the eleventh century to the Reformation, was a period of

grosser corruption and cruelty than you will find in any other period of history even half as long. The grossness of most of the period is concealed under that crude French fiction of the seventeenth century, the Age of Chivalry. Any person who cares to take the trouble will find that there is no historian of repute in Europe who is a recognized authority on any country of Western Europe during the period who does not reject the fiction and admit that the three centuries in question were sordid with general license (in both sexes), cruelty, habitual robbery (by knights and even princes), and a callous indifference to the code of honour or what we call chivalry. During the glittering Renaissance, which adorns the last part of the Middle Ages, the distinguished artists and literary men published descriptions of each other's characters which we may not even translate today; and the alleged Catholic Reformation, which these American historians accept, is as sheer a fabrication as the Age of Chivalry. The weightiest historical authority in English literature, the *Cambridge Modern History*, says (I, 673):

The world has rarely seen a more debased standard of morality than that which prevailed in Italy in the closing years of the Middle Ages.

If this was true when the Papacy had ruled Europe for a thousand years and was more powerful than ever, what should we find in the crude earlier period, the Dark Age?

But in order to show how entirely false the Catholic claim of mediaeval virtue is and to prove that Catholic education *never did* create a high general character, it will be enough to say a few words about the Pope's secular Kingdom (Central Italy), which survived until the year 1870.

A devout and distinguished French priest, Lamennais, described Rome, after a visit to it in the thirties of the last century, as "the most hideous sewer that was ever opened to the eye of man." This is approvingly quoted by the Catholic historian Lady Blennerhassett in the *Cambridge Modern History* (X, 164), and her opinion of the Popes of that time was vigorously supported by the more distinguished Catholic historian Lord Acton. The British ambassador, Lord Clarendon, called it "the opprobrium of Europe." In 1865 the five leading powers—England, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia—sent a caustic open letter, which was published throughout Europe, to the Pope, admonishing him to raise his kingdom to the general level of European civilization; yet four years later Sir Edward Dicey found Rome still "one of the most corrupt, debauched, and demoralized of cities" (*Rome in 1860*). Contemporary Italian Catholics of serious character—Cardinal Scala, Mgr. Liverani, Count Farini, the Marquis d'Azeglio—give us the ugly details; and Lady Blennerhassett summarizes them in the *Cambridge Modern History*. And in defense of this system, says the most respected Catholic historian, Lord Acton, in his *Correspondence* (1917, I, 55), "the Popes contrived murder and massacre on the most cruel and inhuman scale."

Such had the social and moral condition of the Pope's Kingdom remained, except for a few years of partial reform in the sixteenth century, since the Middle Ages, and when the Italian government, after an overwhelming vote of the people in their favour, took it over in 1870, it was a very real case of cleansing the Augean stables. They absorbed also the Kingdom of Naples (South Italy), which was equally foul; yet its dissipated rulers had, according to the contemporary Catholic historians of Naples, done to death (in massacres, executions, and poisonous jails) 250,000 unarmed men and women in sixty years for opposing the corruption of Church and State under the eyes and with the approval of the Pope.

Travellers often wondered, at the beginning of the present century, why the northern cities of Italy were cleaner and more advanced than those of the south; just as they had been much earlier than Rome and Naples in the development of the Renaissance. It was because they had not for many centuries been under the direct rule of the Popes; as Central Italy and, practically, Southern Italy were from the ninth century to the nineteenth. These were still so foul when, in 1870, the Italian government, at the expressed wish of the people, took them over and began to cleanse their social life that Italy remained for years the most criminal country in Europe. Yet so grossly is our public education conducted that the press speaks with profound respect of those "Holy Fathers", whose Kingdom only 80 years ago was described by a British statesman as "the shame of Europe," and professes to regard them as the world's supreme moral and social guides.

It was about this time that governments began to compile and publish statistics of crime, and there is a valuable collection of these early statistics in Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics* (1899) and, for the first decade of the present century, in Webb's supplementary *Dictionary*; and I will quote a few of the more significant.

I have taken careful account of the many pitfalls against which one must guard in quoting statistics of crime. The classification of crimes and delinquencies varies greatly from country to country. In the more advanced countries, with large cities and industries, there is a far higher proportion of lighter offences like the violation of traffic and customs-regulations; and these countries have, and especially had in the last century, a much more efficient police, so that a rough comparison of the total offences is, from the angle of character, apt to be unjust to the more civilized countries.

For instance, from 1878 to 1888 England and Wales reported 1786 murders and 818 indecent assaults as known to the police, yet there were no arrests in the case of 1094 of these crimes and only 154 murderers were executed. In Italy and Spain the proportion of undetected crimes must have been much larger, yet the figures are appalling. Mulhall quotes the following figures, from the famous Italian criminologist Bodio, of the number of trials for murder in the

year 1880. I add the total population of each country at the time and the Catholic proportion of it:

<i>Country</i>	<i>Murders</i>	<i>Total Population</i>	<i>Catholic Percentage</i>
Italy	2,720	27,000,000	90%
Spain	1,265	17,000,000	90%
Hungary	1,180	16,000,000	60%
France	582	37,000,000	80%
Ireland	96	5,000,000	95%
England & Wales	148	25,000,000	3%
Germany	602	45,000,000	33%

In case any reader does not at once see the monstrous reflection on the Catholic system which these figures imply, let me give a further list, which shows the proportion of murders per million inhabitants at a late date in the last century:

England & Wales	12 per million
Scotland	13 " "
Germany	13 " "
France	23 " "
Ireland	24 " "
Austria	30 " "
Spain	72 " "
Italy	101 " "

Further analysis deepens the guilt of the Catholic communities. Mulhall gives a racial analysis of the criminals in England and Wales, and this shows that the Irish living in England, who were then 2% of the population, were 14% of the grosser criminals; and it will not be doubted that the police in Ireland itself were far less efficient than the English and left more murderers in Ireland undetected.

This is true also in regard to Italy and Spain in comparison with the police of France and Germany, so that the total volume of crime in the Catholic countries was far greater than these terrible figures convey. For Portugal at this time no figures are available. In the case of Germany Mulhall shows that the Catholic provinces were much more criminal than Protestant Prussia; and we shall find this confirmed at a later date. In Italy the appalling figure shows, not an increase of crime *after* the anti-Papal government took over in 1870 but, considering the growth of the population, an appreciable reduction from Papal days. Bodio gives the number of murders in Italy in 1871 as 5,297; in 1882 as 4,524, and an increased population.

Another table in Mulhall shows the average in 1876-84 of all the graver crimes except sex (for which he had not the figures) :

England & Wales	61,058	294	902	59,220	27
Scotland	11,454	40	510	10,840	4
Ireland	5,926	96	506	5,260	5
Belgium	20,642	117	11,740	7,880	5.5
France	74,876	816	25,780	45,940	37
Germany	222,694	602	70,500	143,810	45
Hungary	26,574	1,602	7,920	14,520	6
Italy	127,372	3,712	59,210	62,910	28
Spain	23,502	1,807	8,985	12,430	16

Note that the poverty of the Irish and the Spanish, which is pleaded in extenuation of their criminality, is reflected only in their crimes against property, which are not higher but lower than in the richer countries. The Italians, on the other hand, who had more large cities, equalled the English in crimes against property, besides having, in proportion to the population, ten times as many murders and a hundred times as many cases of stabbing. Spain is nearly as bad as Italy in crimes against the person; and these are fouler indications of general character because they betray a less effective education in self-control. Offences against property are more apt to be calculated and to be regarded as clever rather than immoral acts.

A third test yields the same result, especially if we allow for the fact that the police-force was far more efficient in northern and central European countries than in the Catholic south. It is the proportion to the general population of men and women in prison in 1887:

England & Wales	90	per 100,000	
Scotland	52	"	"
Ireland	66	"	"
Holland	82	"	" (one-third Catholic)
Sweden & Norway	40	"	" (entirely Protestant)
Belgium	98	"	"
France	158	"	"
Italy	230	"	"

If the English figure of 90 per 100,000 seems, in comparison with the Irish figure, to disturb my general conclusion, remember that 14 per cent of the crime in England was due to Irish immigrants and a further proportion to Italians. Ireland had no foreign element; and the English law created more offences (traffic, etc.) and the police were much stricter (about drunkenness, gambling, etc.) than the Irish police were. In the case of Holland, too, we shall see that the Catholic population supplied an undue proportion of the criminals.

Thus whatever test we apply in our diagnosis of the moral condition of the Catholic and the non-Catholic countries of Europe in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the fact that the Catholic countries were the lower in character—and the closer they were to Rome the worse they were—emerges so clearly and consistently that the inadequacy of Catholic education, in school and church, is overwhelmingly demonstrated.

Of Poland, which was at that time part of the Russian Empire, we have no separate statistics, but since we shall find in it the same inferiority of character after it becomes an independent Republic, under the strictest rule of the Church, we may safely infer what its character was in the last century. In regard to Portugal also, which was then beneath the notice of social students and statisticians, we have only the reports of travellers, and these invariably give the Portuguese the same character as the Spanish. And that it was even worse in Spanish America we have ample evidence in a work by two Spanish officials (*Noticias Secretas de America*, 1826). Whether, therefore, we consider the Catholics in "exile" in England or at home in their purely Catholic "atmosphere"—whether we study them in the geniality and comfort (as compared with the lot of the industrial workers of England) of Bavaria, Holland, or Brittany or in the poverty of Spain and south Italy—they betray a greater proneness to crime than non-Catholics do.

It is very important to appreciate this situation of seventy years ago. The period was an early phase of the invasion of the planet by the modern spirit, which the Papacy so poignantly deploras and so gravely libels. It reflects the first comprehensive attempt of modern thought to raise the moral or social level of the race; which, as I said, had been lamentably low throughout the Catholic Era. The Reformation had done less than is generally believed to raise this general level of character, and the claim that there was a Catholic Reformation in southern lands is a sheer historical untruth. The Catholic may, if he chooses, say that Spain and Italy had, from some mysterious causes—for there was no Industrial Revolution in them—*sunk* in the nineteenth century to the low level at which we have found them, but the social historian would smile. They just lingered, under the eye of the Pope, in their mediaeval condition.

CHAPTER II

Crime and Corruption in America

Fifty-four years ago Pope Leo XIII wrote a stern letter, which found its way into the Press, to Cardinal Gibbons and the American bishops. It censured what the Pope disdainfully called their "Americanism;" their dilution of the strict teaching of the Roman Church in order to make it palatable to Americans. Not for a century or two had so offensive a letter been sent by the Vatican to the heads of any national branch of the Church.

Today the American Church is the brightest jewel in the papal crown. The American hierarchy and clergy have, it is estimated, a capital wealth of about \$4,000,000,000 and an income of at least \$800,000,000 a year; and since there is no country in the world in which money speaks so eloquently as it does in America, the Church enjoys a remarkable political influence and has a malignant power over the press, literature, education, the cinema, radio, television, and the theatre. It is whispered that the cardinal-archbishop of New York is to be the next Pope, and that a site in Brooklyn has been reserved for a new Vatican when the Italian Socialists and Communists unite to take over power, and America will then realize the dream of Hildebrand and assume both the temporal and the spiritual leadership of this erring world.

Yet distinguished Americans deplore that there seems to be more crime and corruption in this country than in any other leading civilization; and this presents an intriguing situation from our present angle. In 1951 Estes Kefauver, Chairman of the Senate Crime Investigation Committee, published a work, *Crime in America*, in which he reproduced the terrible evidence they had received and the character of the more important criminals. In his introductory chapter he says (p. 27):

It is a fearful thing to contemplate how close America has come to the saturation-point of crime and political corruption, which may destroy our strength as a nation.

He recalls the ancient civilizations which, it is so often said, died from the enervation caused by their crimes and corruption. I am afraid that he is here under the spell of one of the historical fictions for which Catholic writers are responsible, but at least no man knows more than he about crime in his own country today, and he asks:

Have crime and political corruption reached the point where America, too, must follow the downward path of others?

And his verdict is endorsed by the distinguished Chicago lawyer, Austin Wyman. Reviewing Kefauver's book in the *Journal of Criminal Law* (December, 1951), he says:

Organized crime is not a convenient whipping boy, a mere shadow in the alley, but a cancerous growth in our vitals, its malignance multiplying its cells daily.

And this organized crime—mainly gambling, narcotics, prostitution, black-market dealing, and the corruption of police officials—must be added to the volume of grave crime which I give presently from the reports of the Federal Board of Investigation; and this is itself larger, in proportion to population, than in any other leading civilization.

For a country in which Catholics claim to be about one-fifth of the population and have prodigious wealth and power this is a painful record; and if we read Kefauver's report closely we see that Catholics have an amazing share in this organization of crime. The majority of the names that were brought before the Crime Investigation Committee were Italian, and the rest were mainly Irish. This means that the great majority of the master-criminals, or their fathers, came from two of the most Catholic areas in Europe; and it has long been one of the little ironies of American city-life that the men who notoriously grew rich by the organization of crime usually had the most gorgeous Catholic funerals.

Is there any definite evidence that the suspicion which these facts inspire is justified? There is plenty, and it is not open to question. Even in the *Uniform Reports*, which the Federal Board of Investigation publishes every six months under the eyes of the Catholic hierarchy, we get a few indications: though, naturally, the officials are not permitted the indiscretion of classifying the criminals according to their creeds, as is done, for instance, in Canada. There is, however, a considerable body of other evidence, partly either official or Catholic, of the guilt of the Church.

In the case of a new country like America we have no need to glance back into earlier history, as we shall do in the case of the Latin countries, with disastrous results to the Church. It is, however, material to notice in the American record that Catholics were prominent in the organization of crime in the cities from the earliest days of the nineteenth century, or as soon as they became numerous; and that this tendency, increasing decade by decade, has had more than any other factor to do with that corruption of politicians and the police which has so much fostered the growth of crime in America.

Take the story of Tammany, as it is told in Myers's *History of Tammany Hall* (1901). This political club became the centre of the New York Democrats in 1789. It was, Myers says, mainly maintained by the Catholic Irish of New York, and it is still, after a century of corruption, in their hands and still corrupt. Between 1860 and 1870 it robbed New York, brazenly, of \$35,000,000 and inspired a similar

corruption in Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Pittsburg, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Washington, Cincinnati, New Orleans, and other cities—generally Catholic strongholds—throughout the last century. On its complexion today there was a bold and startling article in so impartial a periodical as *Collier's Weekly* in 1933 (February 11). It described Tammany as still corrupt and still overwhelmingly Catholic. "The entire system," the writer says, "has its being in prostitution." Yet 34 of its 36 Captains were Catholics (with two Jews). Cardinal Hayes was at that time represented on its board of strategy by the minor prelate Mgr. Chadwick, who was a sort of chaplain to the group, which gathered at his Church for Mass every Sunday morning. No sort of legal action followed the publication of this article, and its statements were supported by a similar article by R. Glendinning in *Plain Talk Magazine* (February 1933). It was Tammany that pressed the Catholic Al Smith as candidate for the Presidency in 1932, although these facts were generally, if vaguely, known in America; and since the names of Irish, Italian, and Polish Catholics appeared constantly in the Press in connection with crime—a point which is, as I said, tremendously strengthened by the proceedings of the Senate Crime Investigation—he seemed for a time to have a chance of election.

New York is not the most Catholic city in America. In the days of sailing ships and of the first slow steam-packets, when the immigrants dreaded the long voyage, the Irish for the most part made for the nearer port of Boston. This is claimed to have the largest proportion of Catholics and is in fact dominated by Irish politicians. But no figures of crime or official reports of the creed of criminals were published, and Catholic writers were able to plead prejudice and misrepresentation. In 1925, however, they were dismayed when the officials of Sing Sing, the great New York jail, published an analysis of the creeds of the prisoners. Catholics are very generous when they count the numbers of their adherents and include any person who had once received baptism, though he may have emphatically rejected the creed in mature years—I am a unit in the total of English Catholics—yet they have never claimed that they number more than 22 per cent of the inhabitants of New York; and, of course, they in fact number less. Yet the officials reported that the prisoners in Sing Sing were, on their own professions, thus divided:

Catholics	848
Protestants	301
Jews	240
Others	31

We can understand that a criminal with no religion might hope to get some alleviation by concealing that fact, but he had no advantage if he called himself Catholic rather than Protestant. And the Catholic chaplains accepted the unflattering figures. One usually

reads that the Catholic chaplain of Sing Sing first published the figures in an article in the Catholic *Commonweal* (December 14, 1932), but they were already known. In 1931-2 they were, according to this Father John McCaffrey:

Catholics	855
Protestants	518
Jews	177
Others	21

The Catholic criminals were still 60 per cent of the inmates of the New York jail and only about 20 per cent of the inhabitants of the city; and I may add that an enquiry among the prostitutes of New York showed much the same disproportion of Catholic-Irish girls.

In 1936 the Catholic chaplain of the Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet, which harbours Chicago's numerous criminals when the police *do* decide to arrest them, persuaded a number of other Catholic chaplains to join with him in publishing their figures, and the result was the publication of the book to which I referred in the introduction (*Crime and Religion*, by Leo Kalmer and Egidius Weir): the one book in English on the subject that is to any extent based upon statistics, though they relate only to a part of America. It gives these percentages of Catholic criminals in most of the larger jails of America in 1936:

Sante Fe (New Mexico)	66.67	per cent
Wettersfield (Conn.)	63.64	" "
Auburn (New York)	59.31	" "
Sing Sing (New York)	54.77	" "
Florence (Arizona)	53.33	" "
Charleston (Mass.)	53.29	" "
Joliet (Ill.)	48.50	" "
Trenton (New Jersey)	47.61	" "
San Quentin (Cal.)	46.72	" "

As Catholics do not claim that in any of the large cities which these jails serve, except Boston, they form even one half of the inhabitants, and in most cases they claim only 20 to 40 per cent, these official figures, endorsed by the Catholic chaplains—and they will hardly be accused of trying to enlarge their numbers by annexing convicted criminals—afford formidable evidence of the failure of Catholic education. Such southern cities as New Orleans and Santa Fe, which were taken over from the Spanish or the French, may very well have the high percentage of Catholics which they claim, but their claim that 74.3 per cent of the people of Boston are Catholics is absurd. Of the 345 churches in that city only 68 are Catholic

(*Encyclopaedia Americana*). They claim 40 per cent in Chicago (the worst city in America), 35 per cent in San Francisco, 29 per cent in Philadelphia, and 22 per cent in New York. The proportion of the Catholics in the jails of these cities may seem to them a melancholy confirmation of their claims.

No analysis of jail-population in comparison with the Catholic population of the city which would relieve the Catholic Church of its responsibility has ever been published. We may be confident that if any large jail showed a different result it would have been, not merely published, but trumpeted by the Catholic writers, so we may safely conclude that this is the general criminal situation in America.

There is strong confirmation in the number of murders committed annually in the leading cities, according to the current *American World Almanac*. The cities with more than 100 murders a year are (on the latest figures that I have):

Chicago	326
New York	315
Philadelphia	117
Baltimore	110
Houston	106
Detroit	103

All these are amongst the more Catholic cities; they are much more Catholic than Paris. It is hardly necessary to remind the reader of the size of their populations, but if the Catholic claim had any validity the presence of so large a Catholic body ought to reduce the total of grave crime comparatively to other cities. On the contrary, the number of murders is appalling. Chicago, with a population of 3,000,000, one-third of whom are Catholics, has every year three times as many murders as the whole of England and Wales, with a population of 45,000,000. New York has nearly three times as many to 8,000,000 people as the whole of England and Wales. Philadelphia (2,000,000 population, nearly one-third Catholic) has about the same number as that (average 120) for the whole of England and Wales. This in effect means that the gravest of crimes is twenty times as common as in England; and in England, as I will show, crime is very much more due to non-naturalized Catholic residents than in America. Detroit (1,500,000) and Baltimore (800,000) are amongst the more Catholic cities, and have, in proportion to population, thirty to forty times as many grave crimes as England. London is a remarkably clean city in comparison with any of these American cities with their big Catholic populations, and Catholics are probably—we shall see—hardly more than one-twentieth of the population of London.

To these official figures we must add some which have been ascertained privately, but by exact research. I have referred to the

claim that Catholics form 74.3 per cent—the highest claim they made—of the population of Boston and pointed out that they own only one-fifth of the Churches in that city. In 1949 the Harvard Law School had a severe investigation made into the environment, education, etc., of 500 delinquent children of Boston. The results are given in *Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency* (1950) by Professor S. and Dr. E. Gluck; one of the best recent books on the subject. The authors are in favour of religious education yet they dismiss the question of the *factual* relation of religion to crime in a footnote; and, ironically enough, the one statistic they give is deadly to the religious claim. Of the 500 delinquent children they found that 81.2 per cent had had a Catholic education and only 15 per cent Protestant.

Professor H. Neumeyer quotes in his *Juvenile Delinquency and Modern Science* (1949) an article by W. C. Krevaceus in *Sociology and Social Control* (March 1944). He investigated 761 juvenile delinquents who came before the Children's Bureau at Passaic from 1938 to 1943. Of these 67.89 per cent were Catholics, 22.58 per cent Protestants, and 1.99 per cent Jews. Of all those who claimed religious affiliations 75 per cent attended church-services, most of them every Sunday, and there was little difference between boys and girls.

Professor Tappen tells us in his *Delinquent Girls in Court* (1941) that in Brooklyn, which is strongly Catholic, and other places the Catholic clergy have the privilege, which is denied to Protestants and Jews, of taking delinquent girls from the courts into their own reformatories, and this unfairly reduces the proportion of Catholic girls in public institutions. He is not entirely candid on the subject of religion and crime, yet in his *Juvenile Delinquency* (1949) he quotes from the *Greater New York Federation Book* (1934) the statement that of 7426 juvenile offenders in that city 61.3 per cent were Catholics (who are about 20 per cent of the total population), 21.3 Protestants, and 17 per cent Jews.

In short every analysis of criminals that is given by any American criminologist or sociologist shows that the Catholics have far more than their share of criminality, and this has occasionally been acknowledged by Catholic prelates and writers. Mr. J. Lewis quotes a few examples of this in his *Ten Commandments*. In the *New York Times* (December 8, 1936) Bishop Gallagher, Catholic bishop of Detroit, said in a letter:

It is a matter of serious reproach to the Church that more Catholic boys in proportion to the total number get into trouble than those of any other denominations. One-fifth of the people of Michigan are Catholic, but 50 per cent of the boys in the Industrial School for Boys at Lansing are Catholics.

In the same paper on February 29, 1944, Father Ford of New York says:

During the first four months of 1943, 64 per cent of the juvenile delinquents in the Children's Court were Catholics.

And Catholics form, as I said, only 20 per cent of the population of New York.

In the score of American works on sociology and criminology that I have read, even in the few which count religion as one of the chief agencies for combating crime, not a single statistic is quoted that does not emphatically disprove the Catholic claim; and this goes far to explain why most of them ignore the factual test of that claim. The *Uniform Reports* of the F.B.I., issued under the shadow of the Catholic Welfare building in Washington, discreetly avoid any mention of the creeds of prisoners. And while we estimate the significance of the fact that the figures of crime are so terrible in a country in which the Catholic Church has more wealth, power and numbers than in any other country, we must understand that these reports are not complete. They are not national statistics of crime of the usual character. All that the Federal authorities can do is to invite local authorities which represent about two-thirds of the population to send up their reports, and they estimate the total for the entire country from these; and I gather that some cities, even New York with its terrible burden of crime, refuse to co-operate. No one who knows America, or has read Kefauver's book can doubt that large numbers of crimes are either not reported to the police or not reported by them.

Yet as far as they go these Uniform Crime Reports give us a strange picture of the country which has the good fortune to possess the richest, the most powerful, and probably the largest body of Catholics in the modern world. Mr. Hoover, head of the F.B.I., commenting in the *International Year Book* on the crime figures for 1951, pointed out that they mean that in America a major crime is committed every 18 seconds, a man or woman is murdered or murderously assaulted every 5 minutes, and a girl or woman is raped every half-hour. You may find a situation as grave as that in the more Catholic countries, but certainly not in any other leading civilization.

I will not quote the gigantic total of offences and compare it with the same in other countries, because in this land of, for instance, almost universal automobiles there are enormous numbers of such offences as violations of traffic regulations, larcenies, etc., which would make a comparison with the total number of offences in other countries unjust to the Americans. But compare this list of the gravest crimes in 1949 with the corresponding list for England and Wales:

	<i>United States</i>	<i>England & Wales</i>
Murders & non-negligent manslaughter	6,996	114
Manslaughter by negligence	4,880	131
Rape	16,380	252
Aggravated assault	78,860	3,330 (malicious & felonious wounding)
Burglary	409,460	72,377 (Burglary, housebreaking & shoplifting)
Prisoners	150,104	19,879

In America crime is increased by nearly 5 per cent in 1950 while the fairly complete figures for England show only a moderate increase, and in some of the worst categories (murder) a decrease. Remember also that the population of America is only about three times the size of that of England and Wales, and that, while the classification differs in the two countries I have taken care to make the two sets of figures justly comparable. These official statistics show that in a country in which Catholics claim to be a fifth of the population, and their hierarchy commands more wealth than their entire Church ever had until modern times, there is, in proportion to the size of the population, four or five times as much grave crime as in a country of similar culture in which Catholics claim to be only a seventeenth of the population and have not one-tenth of the wealth of the American Church. And I have already shown that the Catholic section of the American population is more prone to crime than the non-Catholic majority.

The British reader should be reminded that these figures must not be taken too literally as an indication of the general character of the American people. As a rule the volume of crime in a country does indicate the general moral health or ill-health of a community, just as the death-rate gives an idea of the general physical health. But there are special circumstances in the case of America. The unusual amount of political and police corruption is often quoted in explanation, but this has itself to be explained. The same may be said in regard to the abuse of the parole system, which is a serious evil, as the Chief of Police in one large city agreed with me. One feature that is peculiar to America is that the long period of expansion over the West, with little or no law, left a serious legacy of disorder; and into this world came vast hordes of immigrants from the less orderly parts of Europe, especially Ireland and South Italy. These were strictly Catholic areas, and the artificial, defective, wrongly-based moral code they brought with them broke down in their new social environment.

This abnormal Catholic ratio of criminality is encouraged by the concealment of it in official documents and in so much academic literature. British writers are not more satisfactory. They talk, like Sir Cyril Burt, about the social importance of religious education and generally refuse to look at the facts. So the myth, which priests invented, that the influence of their Church sustained the general character at a higher moral level in Ages of Faith than we find to-day—a monstrous historical lie—and that Catholic education renders the same service today and the world will more surely shed its present burdens if we return to the mediaeval creed, is still widely accepted. On this pretext statesmen grant an amazing power to the Pope and his hierarchy in Western Europe and America, and the further demoralization of public and international life to which this leads must be added to the increasing volume of crime.

CHAPTER III

In the Cities of Britain

Britain has the record amongst the more advanced nations not only of having today one of the lightest burdens of crime in proportion to population, but of having done more than others to reduce the volume of crime it had inherited from earlier times. Only a few of the smaller Protestant nations share this distinction. The compilation of exact statistics began about the middle of last century, and the following, which I take from Mulhall's standard *Dictionary of Statistics* gives an adequate idea of the progress that was made. They are the average figures of convictions for grave crime:

1840-9	1850-9	1860-9	1870-9	1880-9	1890-9
21,280	18,390	14,529	11,728	10,800	9,120

If we reflect that the population doubled during that period that the police force was repeatedly reorganized and reformed—which means that convictions increase while the body of known crime may not—see that what is so often called “the century of materialism” was in this respect a vast improvement upon the preceding ages.

Before we ask whether this improvement was sustained after the year 1900, let us note carefully that these are the figures for what was then called the United Kingdom, which included Eire. We shall see that the latter country is much more criminal than Great Britain. In fact, we have to recognize the fact that in England itself the crime-lists were heavily weighted by the crimes of Irish immigrants. It was officially determined by the Census of 1883 that Irishmen were then 2 per cent of the population of England and Wales, but 14 per cent of the inmates of the jails. I may add that the Protestant Scots were 1 per cent of the population and only 2 per cent of the criminals; and that, as the famous Catholic preacher Father Nugent repeatedly complained from his pulpit, the Irish furnished the same lamentable disproportion of the prostitutes. Even English Catholics complained that 25 per cent of the prisoners in British jails were Irish Catholics (*The Tablet*, the chief Catholic weekly, February 12, 1898). Clearly England would have done still better without the Catholic immigrants.

The reduction of crime which gave England so honourable a position in this field continued throughout the first three decades of the present century. Convictions for grave crime were, on the average, 8319 a year during the first decade, 7076 in the second decade, and 6820 in the third; in spite of the First World War, the depression,

and a continued increase of population. In the latest (1951) issue of the *Criminal Statistics for England and Wales* it is stated that the proportion of criminals who were convicted of indictable crime in each 100,000 of the population fell from 194.5 in 1910 to 144.5 in 1929, yet the population had increased by 5,000,000. The number of prisoners in jail fell from 20,826 in 1910 to 12,238 in 1934. It is true that the number of juvenile offenders rose from 288 per 100,000 in 1911 to 439 in 1934 but the authorities warn us that this rather reflects new regulations and greater vigilance on the part of the police.

The rise of the crime-figures since 1934, though lamentable, is not so great as it is sometimes represented by writers or speakers who have particular remedies (more religion, less divorce, etc.) to press upon us, and this type of social critic is the one whose complaints the Press most readily broadcasts. I have before me the complete figures of indictable, non-indictable, and juvenile offences since 1934. A change in the classification during the war is apt to mislead the in-expert but, in spite of the transfer of some categories from the lighter to the graver class, the total of indictable offences, which was 101,936 in 1935, was only 132,807 in 1951; which was scarcely a phenomenal advance if we bear in mind the large increase of population, the lack of police, and the appalling experiences through which the world had passed. Juvenile offences of all kinds were 53,358 in 1935 and 65,623 in 1951: again a lamentable but intelligible rise. The rise was much greater in Eire where there was no war-demoralization.

We must remember that the law has created new offences and the changing conditions of modern life are bound to lead to more offences. The Traffic Act of 1934, for instance, and especially the greater speed and enormously increased volume of traffic, sent up the number of offences while the general average of character did not fall. Of the total number of offences in 1951 (723,320) no less than 51 per cent were violations of traffic-laws. A further 12.2 per cent were larcenies, and the war-conditions and the subsequent scarcity of commodities and the high prices explain that. There can be a considerable rise of offences without a general deterioration. All this has led to an increase in a great variety of offences (smuggling, black-marketing, theft, etc.). Yet there has also been a lamentable increase of violence against the person and of sexual offences.

The causes of this do not properly concern us here, but it is not difficult to understand that the persistence of the war-atmosphere and a certain callousness about the use ("legitimate" or otherwise) of lethal and often barbaric weapons have led to some decay of character. There has also been a big influx, since the bombing of England ended, of people from countries with a higher ratio of criminality, and as in most cases (Irish, Italians, and Free-war Poles) these are people who had had a Catholic education, it would be interesting to give statistics. These, however, are not available, and we must be

content to examine what evidence we have of the preponderance in the English criminal population of those who have been educated in Catholic schools.

The official *Criminal Statistics* no longer provide any clues to the religious professions of criminals. They do not even—and it would be interesting to know why—give us the relative proportion of crime in the more Catholic cities of the north and in the remainder of England. Fortunately we have two sufficiently recent and entirely reliable statistical studies of the relation of crime to Catholic education, and since they describe the situation in two of the most Catholic cities of England and no counter-statistics whatever have been alleged, we may safely conclude that here we have a sound general test of the social value of Catholic schools. The two nearest gates into Britain for more than 2,000,000 impoverished Irishmen who have entered and settled in it during the last hundred years were Liverpool, where Irish Catholics are most numerous today, and Glasgow. From Liverpool, as they overcrowded the poorer quarters, they poured into the large manufacturing towns of Lancashire and Yorkshire, and the two severe and exact enquiries which I quote relate to Liverpool itself and to the Yorkshire city of Bradford.

In the case of Liverpool the results are given in a booklet, *Rome's Responsibility for Juvenile Crime* (1944), by Alderman the Rev. H. D. Longbottom, member of the Liverpool Education Committee and Fellow of the Royal Economic Society; a man with exceptional qualifications and opportunities for the task and a preacher in one of the poorer quarters of the city for twenty years. Liverpool is one-third Catholic and two-thirds Protestant, but Catholic delinquents in it are much more numerous than the children who have passed through the Protestant and the Government schools put together. In 1936, before the period of war-demoralization began, Liverpool reported that its Catholic juvenile delinquents were 23.7 per 10,000, while the figure for the whole of England and Wales was only 8.3 per 10,000. "Similarly large figures", Mr. Longbottom says, "obtain in several other industrial centres in Lancashire" in which there is a large body of Catholics. He quotes an earlier (1929) official statement that "the number of boys under 16 years of age found guilty of dishonesty in the North of England is out of all proportion higher than in the South." So is the ratio of Catholics to non-Catholics.

The common plea of the apologist is that the Irish are poorer than the English and live to a great extent in slums. He does not seem to think it necessary to explain *why* the Irish continue in this poverty even after a decade or more of residence in England. Ald. Longbottom finds the drunkenness of the Irish chiefly responsible, and he correctly says that the Church is here to blame, because it barely admits drunkenness to its long and picturesque list of sins. It is one of the defects of any other than a social code of morality that it

lays little stress on what may be a social scourge and takes a purely individualist view of it.

But Ald. Longbottom shows from the official returns that Catholic schools in the better or mixed districts of Liverpool yield much the same proportion of delinquents as the slum-schools, and that when Catholic schools were bombed during the war and the children were in large numbers transferred to national schools, the ratio of delinquency amongst the pupils of those schools rose (or sank) to the normal high Catholic level. He quotes the figures for three schools that are "cheek by jowl" in the same district. The first is a Government school in which, owing to the bombing, 30 per cent of the pupils are now Catholics and the figure of juvenile delinquents rose to 37 per 1,000. Near by are a Protestant school with a ratio of 16.3 per 1,000 and a purely Catholic school with the figure of 83.7 per 1,000. Other Catholic schools had a ratio of 177.9, 108, 95.7, and 64.8 per 1,000. Protestant and Government schools in the same districts, serving populations at about the same economic level, had ratios of 1.1, 3.1, 14.1, and 15.6. The highest figure for one of these is 16 per 1,000.

Ald. Longbottom, whose figures are taken from official municipal documents that were supplied to all his colleagues as well as himself, closes his exposure of the Catholic system, ironically, by quoting the text of the Papal Encyclical of December 1, 1929: "State Control of Public Schools is the Great Cause of Evil." So successfully do the priests stamp that monstrously mendacious maxim upon the minds of their followers and guard it by threats of eternal punishment if they read works which expose the untruth of it that grave social evil results. More than once Catholic ladies have told me that at a Parliamentary election they close their eyes to every national or international issue and vote for the candidate who glibly promises that he will "do something for the Catholic schools;" that is to say, get the nation to pay the whole cost of building as well as of teaching. Yet wherever we apply the statistical test we find the same evil result as in Liverpool.

The city of Bradford, which has a very large Catholic population, engaged Mrs. E. M. Henshaw, Education Psychologist to the Mental Health Emergency Committee of the city of Manchester, a trained and experienced investigator, to examine and report upon its schools. Her report was published in *Education*, but it is enough here to say that, to the great anger of the Catholics, she reported the same ugly situation as that which was officially recorded in Liverpool. Catholics do not form as large a proportion of the population in Bradford as they do of Liverpool, yet Catholic delinquents were 15 per 1,000 of the school population, Protestant-educated children were 7 per 1,000, and Council-school children only 6 per 1,000. Catholics, who are less than a fourth of the city's population, provide the majority of its juvenile delinquents. The Catholic community is, again, no

oasis of virtue in a desert of crime and vice but rather like a swamp more or less infecting its surroundings.

I have heard of similar analyses with the same result in Glasgow, Manchester, and other northern cities but cannot find that they have ever been published. As these are the chief centres of the Irish Catholics it will not be suggested that they are of superior virtue in just those cities on which we have no specific report: and we shall see that positive evidence gives them the same unfortunate character in the Dominions and in Eire itself. For years they have persuaded the authorities to exclude any clues to this situation from *Criminal Statistics*, and they employ their usual means to prevent publication of the facts. The Church, though hardly counting more than a twentieth of the population, has had a pernicious influence. The Westminster Catholic Federation, through its local committees, watches the Press, publishers, and booksellers everywhere. J. W. Poynter, who was for years in its inner councils and left the Church for a time, describes the tyranny in his books. I have had considerable experience in my work.

In Scotland the situation seems to be much the same as in England. The crime-figures are weighted heavily by the Irish Catholics; for Glasgow is, as I said, the nearest open gate into Britain, after Liverpool, for Irish immigrants. The official *Criminal Statistics* do not help us today, but the chief Sunday paper of the north of England, the *Sunday Dispatch* (May 8, 1950) is clearly drawing upon some official source when it says that it is alleged that Roman Catholics provide 7.8 per cent of the prison population of Glasgow while the entire Roman Catholic population of the country is only 13.26 of the whole." The Irish are thick in all the towns of the Clyde Valley, and their high proportion of evil conduct mars the statistics of an otherwise law-abiding country.

CHAPTER IV

In the British Commonwealth

Thirty or forty years ago the late Mr. H. G. Wells, whose forecasts of the future were beginning to attract attention because they were, it was said, "scientific anticipations," said that the white race of the future would, in regard to religion, gather under only two banners, Rome or Reason. We smile at these prophecies today, when the Pope holds the genuine allegiance of less than a third of the white race, more than half of these are children, and Catholics of the highest intellectual quality are as rare as saints. I had already published a work, *The Decay of the Church of Rome* (1908), in which I showed that the Vatican had lost 50,000,000 subjects in the preceding 50 years and was still losing heavily. It has lost far more since 1908, and its compulsory birth-rate and trickle of conversions barely cover its losses. But my friend Wells was then in the stage of pseudo-liberalism—he emphatically disowned it before he died—which disposes some to consult Catholic writers on Catholic matters, and he was seduced by what they called the "miraculous growth" of their religion in the English-speaking world.

There never was a worse fallacy or a grosser deception of the public. This apparent increase was just one aspect of the dispersal of the impoverished Irish and (in the case of America) the impoverished Poles and Italians and backward folk from many countries. In the year 1880 the population of Ireland was 5,500,000, so the population of the three Catholic provinces which now constitute Eire was at least 4,000,000. Now the population of England, which has since passed through the deadly experience of the Industrial Revolution, and in the second half of the last century began extensively to practice birth-control, has quadrupled, so the population of Catholic Ireland (Eire), which had no devastating Industrial Revolution and is strictly to indulge in the wicked practice of birth control that has severely checked the growth of population in England, must have increased to at least the same extent and be today about 18,000,000. But the population of Eire is less than 3,000,000. Where are the 15,000,000? They are, of course, the "miraculous growth" of the Church in America, Canada, Britain, Australia and New Zealand; and wherever they have gone they have, while they claim a monopoly of the word "holy", raised the normal level of criminality.

The official figures that show this in the case of Australia and New Zealand used to be readily available, for the Government publications clearly stated the religious professions of criminals, and these were given each year in the *Statesman's Yearbook*. Like so many other governments, those of Australia and New Zealand are no longer

so liberal, for, although the Catholics do not claim to be quite one-fifth of the 8,185,529 people of Australia, through the Irish members of the Trade Unions and in recent years owing to the world-drift of Liberals into alliance with the Catholics against the Soviet Union, they exercise a power even greater than they do in Britain.

In 1949 a Protestant Australian weekly, *The Rock*, angered the Catholic hierarchy by exposing the scandal of the Catholic laundries; which, as in other countries, are sweating shops shining in a mantle of virtue. Shortly afterwards (September 14) the Attorney General introduced into the Legislative Assembly of the State of Victoria a Police Offences Bill in which it was proposed to extend the legal penalty of publishing obscene literature to all literature that is "blasphemous or likely to incite abhorrence against any religion or any religious denomination or sect."

Protestants and Rationalists, who form five-sixths of the population of Victoria, succeeded in forcing their Protestant Government to abandon this monstrous proposal, but the scandalous political power of the Church, through the Irish vote, remains. Six years earlier, in the sister-state of New South Wales, Professor John Anderson, who holds the Chair of philosophy in Sydney University, was censured by both Houses of Parliament for writing that "teachers would be well-advised to keep the clergy out of the schools." Yet he had before him official Australian statistics which told that Catholics are only 21 per cent of the population of the State but 32 per cent of the population of its jails!

Let no one infer from such incidents that, as apologists are apt to claim, in Australia at least the Irish are particularly loyal and devoted to their Church. In 1950 a special Gallup Survey in the Commonwealth enquired into the extent of Church-going. In the case of Catholics this test is decisive, for every Catholic is bound under penalty of eternal punishment to attend mass every Sunday morning unless prevented by serious illness or other "grave cause." A quarter of the population admitted that they *never* go to Church, and of those (23 per cent) who go to Church every Sunday only a little over one-half are Catholics. In other words, 62 per cent of those who profess to be Catholics in the Census, and still less of those who figure in the Church-statistics, are genuine Catholics, since the idea of a man really believing that he incurs eternal damnation every week is preposterous. The sociologist will deplore that hundreds of thousands of citizens have this sloppy type of mind, and that a Church which violently fought the introduction of democracy into Christendom for seven centuries is now enabled by such means to use the democratic vote to augment its wealth and power.

I first drew attention in my *Truth About Secular Education* (1909) to the Australian statistics of crime and religion and gave the figures from 1890 to 1904. In the following year I gave my first lecture-tour in Australia and New Zealand, and in spite of my public

criticism of the Church was received with honour. I was entertained publicly by the Premier and Cabinet of Victoria, the Rector of Sydney University, the Premier of Queensland, and the Rector of new Zealand University.

Full official figures on Catholicism and crime were given me privately by an official of the Education Department of Victoria and by my friend Sir Robert Stout, the Chief Justice of New Zealand. For more than a quarter of a century after that date the official Year Books and (copying from them) the *British Statesman's Year Book* gave the statistics of crime and their Catholic proportion for each State, and I often reproduced them. The facts are now concealed, and a lecturer who dared to call attention to them would hardly be admitted to the Commonwealth or the Dominion. As I have just shown from the recent Gallup Survey, although Australia is less Catholic than ever, the Church is enormously more powerful than ever, and the ratio of criminality in the Catholic world is as bad as ever.

For New South Wales, the most Catholic of the States and one in which the Church is supposed to have drastically reformed its education since 1933, an available figure is that of the proportion of Catholics amongst the prisoners in the jails. The constancy of this proportion over a period of thirteen years is sufficient support of my statement that from the beginning of the century to our time the Church of Rome has, if we count serious adherents, neither gained in numbers (in spite of its drastic condemnation of birth control and the continuous immigration) in proportion to the general population nor reduced its high proportion of criminality.

Roundly, Catholics are, and have been for 40 or 50 years, one-fifth of the population of Australia and have supplied about one-third of its criminal offenders. I give these figures for New South Wales from the official *Year Book*, as they were published in the *Vigilant*:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Total Prisoners</i>	<i>Catholic Prisoners</i>	<i>Proportion of Catholics</i>
1934	1515	540	35 per cent
1935	1398	454	32 " "
1936	1330	464	34 " "
1937	1183	404	34 " "
1938	1176	422	35 " "
1939	1364	481	35 " "
1940	1357	487	35 " "
1941	1236	423	34 " "
1942	1497	471	31 " "
1943	1558	529	33 " "
1944	1739	614	35 " "
1945	1856	650	35 " "
1946	1684	560	33 " "

Throughout the above period Catholics, or individuals who had had a Catholic education, strictly supervised by the clergy or the nuns, formed not more than 20 per cent of the population of New South Wales and provided 30 per cent of the population of its jails.

A pamphlet issued by the Queensland State Schools Defence Fund in 1937 gives, from official sources, the corresponding figures for the States of Victoria and Queensland. In 1935 the Catholics in Victoria, who are only 18 per cent of the population, ought to have had, if they were merely as lawabiding as their neighbours, 754 prisoners in the jails. They had three times that number (2164). In Queensland, where they claim to be 21 per cent of the population, they ought, on the same basis, to have had only 249 prisoners in jail. Again they had three times as many (744).

"And the oddest thing of all", said an Australian writer commenting on the above figures, "is that nearly half the delinquent females in New South Wales are Catholics, most of them educated by nuns". It was not much better, as regards female prisoners, in Victoria. Of the total number of prisoners in 1936 (7545) about one-third were Catholics (2648), but of the women criminals (835) more than 40 per cent were Catholics. And, lest the plea be made that, the ages of these adult prisoners not being given, we must be dealing with men and women who have had their Catholic education completely obliterated by life in the courser parts of Australian cities, I quote a few figures of different dates in the last twelve years from the records of the Children's Courts of Victoria.

The first figures are for the year 1934. In that year 420 of the juvenile delinquents that appeared before the Court were Catholics, who are only 18.79 per cent of total population of Victoria; while the remaining 81.21 per cent of the population had only 758 children before the Court. The proportion of Catholic delinquents was considerably more than double their ratio in the community. This chronic scandal of the Catholic school led to much discussion, and Archbishop Mannix, the most sonorous Catholic apologist, an Irishman who hated England, took the field against the critics of his Church in 1937 (*Argus*, April 5):

He said that he had visited a Catholic boys' reformatory recently and there he expected to find that 90 per cent of the boys came from Catholic schools and 10 per cent from the State schools. However, he had learned that more than 50 per cent of them came from State Schools.

What 50 per cent of non-Catholic boys were doing in a Catholic reformatory is not stated. It is clear that he uses his figures recklessly, as was his wont, and that in any case this cannot distract us from the scandal of the official statistics of the Children's Court. In that very year (1937) the record of the court, as later published, was that of 1555 delinquents, 582 or 37.4 per cent were Catholics, who were only 18 per cent of the community. In 1940 the Catholic de-

linquents were 1236 to 1433 others: in 1941 Catholics were 878 to 1230: in 1942 they were 1230 to 2186: in 1943 they were 990 to 1905: in 1944 they were 628 to 1366: in 1945 they were again 628 to 1216: and in 1950 (the latest available) they were 36 per cent of the whole. It is the chronic situation.

There is no need to work out the proportion of Catholic criminals in the other Australian States, and indeed their statistics seem to be issued in a form that yields no clue to the figure. It is enough to say that while Catholics claim to be 18 per cent of the population of Western Australia, and the population is one-fourth as large as that of Victoria, convictions for crime in it when I last visited it were 12,758 to 15,741 in Victoria. South Australia has one-third the population of Victoria and a much less proportion (80,990) of Catholics, yet it has a much better criminal record than the other States. But the evidence of the statistics of juvenile crime that I have given is much more definite and convincing, and we may conclude that, instead of the Catholic Church justifying the power which it has obtained by political trickery in Australia and proving itself a firm influence in the social order, it everywhere turns out many more children who take to crime than either the Protestant or the purely secular schools do.

In the case of New Zealand we have the same difficulty in finding religious clues in recent statistics. When I first visited the country in 1910 my friend Sir Robert Stout, the finest Chief Justice the Dominion has ever had, gave me—expressly for publication—certain statistics which he had supplied to the *New Zealand Times* in 1898 (August 1) and which he guaranteed to be a fair statement of the situation in 1910. The first set gives the percentage of each Church in the population of the country and in the criminal population:

	<i>Of Population</i>	<i>Of Criminals</i>
Church of England.....	40.27 per cent	41.47 per cent
Catholics.....	14.07 “ “	32.95 “ “
Presbyterians.....	22.78 “ “	17.15 “ “
Wesleyans	10.44 “ “	3.00 “ “
Others.....	12.44 “ “	5.16 “ “

The second table gives the percentage of inhabitants born in the chief countries which contribute to its population and in the criminal world:

	<i>Born</i>	<i>Criminals</i>
New Zealand.....	62.85 per cent	24.43 per cent
England and Wales.....	16.89 “ “	28.05 “ “
Ireland.....	6.55 “ “	20.61 “ “
Scotland.....	7.18 “ “	12.76 “ “
Australia.....	3.10 “ “	4.70 “ “
Others.....	3.43 “ “	9.45 “ “

The proneness to crime of the Irish who had had a Catholic education is conspicuous in both these tables.

The *Canada Year Book* is a fine statistical publication and it continues to give a few clues to the relation of crime to Catholic education. There is not the same violence and drunkenness amongst the French peasants and farmers of Quebec as amongst those of Ireland, and in approaching the study of crime in Canada I did not, in view of the solid bloc of Catholics in Quebec, expect to find quite the same dishonourable record as in America, Britain and Australia. In fact there is no other State in which the Roman Church has a more respectable record as regards crime than it has in Canada. Yet here, as everywhere else, its schools and its Churches contribute more offenders to the criminal world than the schools of other religious denominations do; more than they ought to contribute if they had at least the same social value as non-Catholic schools.

And in solidly Catholic Quebec, with its 3,000,000 population (more than that of Eire), the Church has what it considers to be ideal conditions for the full use of its educative influence. When England took over Quebec from the French it granted extraordinary privileges to the priests, such as that they could legally compel the inhabitants of any district which had no Church to provide one. They still have these privileges. A few days before I write this I read in the London *Daily Express* that several merchants in Montreal have been summoned and heavily fined for keeping their places of business open on one of the Church's "Holy Days"

One short table in the Year Book gives an analysis of the religious professions of men and women who have been convicted of serious crime. The figures for 1947 and 1948, the last available are:

	1947	1948
Total major crimes.....	44,056	41,632
Catholics	18,690	19,594
Protestants	21,271	20,408

Catholics were found at the last Census to be 43 per cent of the population of Canada and Protestants 49 per cent. In 1947 the Catholic ratio of crime is almost identical with their population to the general population, whereas the clergy and nuns claim a considerable social superiority for Catholic education. But this was an exceptional year. In 1948 the Catholic ratio among the major criminals is much higher than it ought to be. We get the same impression when we consider the total volume of crime and the size of the population. The population of Canada is under one-fourth the population of England and Wales, but the total volume of crime reported (918,277) in the most recent year (1948) was actually greater than the total volume (723,220) reported in the last available year in England and Wales.

Catholics form nearly half the population of Canada, but they do not even claim—and the claim would be preposterous—to be more than one-fifteenth of the population of England and Wales. Juvenile delinquents are, unfortunately, not, as they are in Australia, divided according to their religious affiliations, so that I cannot produce any evidence on that important point. It is enough that in this half-Catholic Dominion, including an enormous and highly privileged Catholic-bloc, the criminal statistics are much higher than in Great Britain, and the Catholic ratio of the more serious criminals is higher than normal and, as everywhere else, makes a mockery of Catholic pretensions. Grave crime is, as I have indicated, proportionately less than in England, but the classification differs and one can compare only the whole volume of crime in each country.

CHAPTER V

The Crime - Record of the Irish

We have now seen abundant statistics, the meaning of which no sophistry can obscure, showing that in the English-speaking world, the advanced one-tenth of the race that is dispersed from San Francisco to New Zealand, the Catholic element is everywhere the most criminal, and that these Catholics are predominantly Irish or of Irish derivation. In no state or province have we found any exception in the official figures to this general truth. It is the same with emigrants who linger in their native poverty and drift inertly into the slums of British and American cities and with their children and grandchildren who share the greater prosperity of the lands they have adopted. Indeed, this plea of poverty as an excuse, which if it were sound would heavily condemn their education as a preparation for civic and adult life, is decisively refuted by the fact that this superior criminality manifests itself even more in offences against the person than in offences against property. Poverty might mitigate our condemnation of the thief, but it is no extenuation of crimes of murder, assault, and rape.

The extension of our enquiry to what are called the Latin countries and the contrast of Protestant countries will complete the proof that the root of this tendency to crime and delinquency is Catholic education, in school and Church. But we have first to examine the apologist's plea that in Eire itself, where their "Holy Mother the Church" can genially exert her full influence as there is no heretical contagion, the Irish are virtuous and law-abiding.

The reader who has any acquaintance with Irish life will greet the plea with a smile. The belief that the Irish are, as a body, witty is a crude misrepresentation of their boisterous joviality, as G. B. Shaw showed in his *John Bull's Other Island*, and their virtue is equally mythical. If there are two general defects of their life that attract attention they are, and always have been, drinking and fighting; while gambling is regarded as so innocent a recreation that the priests and nuns exploit it in their lotteries for sacred purposes. This does not impress us as an atmosphere in which virtue will particularly flourish.

The enquiry is an important part of our research because in Eire today we have the most solid faith in the Roman creed in the modern world and, therefore, the surest test of its social efficacy. Pre-war Poland alone had something like the same solid faith when Portugal and Spain had so far admitted modern thought as to dis-

establish the Church. This was not due to any quality of the Irish or the Polish people. I pointed out forty years ago, and it is now a recognized social principle, that the main condition of human progress is that there shall be free interchange of ideas and culture on the part of individuals and nations. Ireland and Poland were, so to say, islands lying off the shore of the area of European culture; and in the case of Ireland the priests had the additional advantage that during two or three centuries England had roused the hatred of the people and they were able to harden the national mind against the religion of their oppressors.

It is my purpose here to show that Catholic education not only is, but invariably has been since nations began to collect and publish exact statistics of crime, a demoralizing factor. We can neither allow that what it stupidly calls "the materialism of the last century" weakened the moral inspiration of the Church nor that the very real demoralization of our time accounts for the present outcrop of criminals. As I will show in the final chapter, the basis of the moral and social code which the Church lodges in the minds of its pupils always was, and is, apt to crumble in the air of a free world. So in each case I give a few statistics for the second half of the nineteenth century and for different dates in the present century.

For Ireland I quoted some statistics of crime of 60 or 70 years ago in the first chapter. Although its population was then one-tenth that of England it reported about 90 murders a year while the whole of England reported only about 100. The first two decades of the present century, which were disturbed by the struggle for independence that broke into open rebellion in 1916, are not, perhaps, a period of normal statistics. Years afterwards, by the way, it transpired that the Pope had secretly blessed the rebellion though the whole Catholic hierarchy in Ireland had condemned it: a curious example of the treachery of Rome that was likely to encourage world scepticism. The *Irish Times*, which was regarded as De Valera's particular organ, said on May 26, 1933:

Today Ireland learns for the first time one of the most moving and most glorious stories in connection with the Easter Week Rising. Before it took place Benedict XV received a mission from the Irish Volunteer Executive in the person of George Noble, Count Plunkett. The Count had a private audience of two hours with His Holiness and disclosed to him the decision to rise and the date of the insurrection, and received from him his Apostolic Benediction on the men who were facing death for Irish liberty.

Few will quarrel with the Irish for rising against the English, though the rebellion was pathetic in its futility. But if the news of the Pope's blessing had leaked out at the time or soon after it, the Vatican, which was bargaining with England, would certainly have issued one of its suave denials. And the docile Irish leaders, when England

granted them independence a few years later and the facts could safely be published, hailed this further proof of moral duplicity on the part of their supreme guide as a most moving and glorious act!

However, independence was freely granted a few years later (1921), though there is still a little clerical haze about the title. Eire is "an independent sovereign State, but with certain special relations to the British Commonwealth;" in other words, the British clergy do not want the half-million Irish who fill their Churches turned into foreigners, and the Irish hierarchy look with a benevolent eye upon the stream of gold they send or bring back to Eire. But all that concerns us here is that for the last thirty years they have re-established and preserved in Eire that mediaeval atmosphere in which they flourish best. Their censorship of imported literature is notorious, and to the curiosity which is often aroused in the minds of Irishmen about the forbidden books—about the ideas which George Moore, Yeats, Joyce, and most of the Irish writers of distinction admitted—Irish clergy reply with lies. In a booklet by the Jesuit Father Lord, published by the Catholic Truth Society of Ireland (*I Can Read Anything*, p. 22), we read:

"Has it occurred to you that, when you read books of this sort, you pit your minds, as yet not fully matured and trained, against the trained, clever, brilliant minds of men skilled in their lines and adept in their methods? And when they are utterly unscrupulous, as, let's say, Joseph McCabe is, and will twist any bit of history to make a case, and pile yarn on yarn to construct a proof, and use fable for fact and supposition for solid argument, what chance has the average reader against them?"

I showed this to H. G. Wells, when he wrote in his *Cruxes Answered* (1943): "McCabe is one of the most able and interesting and learned of all anti-Catholic writers." His comment is not in the dictionary.

The "Catholic Truth" Society of England has never ventured to make such libellous statements, but a correspondent informed me that when he wrote to its London headquarters for some reply of theirs to my writings, he was advised to write to the Dublin Society for this pamphlet. Its address is, ironically enough, Veritas (Truth) House, and it promises "rich spiritual privileges" if you subscribe to it.

Let me make quite clear that I take every figure which I quote here in regard to Irish crime direct from the official *Statistical Abstract*, published annually by the Eire Government, and that, since 2,800,000 of the total population of 2,950,000 inhabitants are Roman Catholics, there is no question of trying to separate Catholic and non-Catholic crime. We have, therefore, only to compare the total volume of crime in its three principal categories—indictable, non-indictable, and juvenile—with the totals of crime in non-Catho-

lic countries. Although there are only about 2,000,000 Catholics in England and Wales, it will be convenient to take these for comparison, but we must not forget that a quite appreciable proportion of the crime in England and Wales is committed by Irishmen.

It will then be seen that the unctuous pleas of English priests, that we will reduce crime only by returning to the mediaeval faith, not only betray a quite humorous ignorance of the grossness of morals in the Middle Ages but, on a comparison of English and Irish social behaviour today, are seen to be preposterous. As both countries publish adequate statistics of crime annually in English, any person can make the comparison. To put it in a nutshell, England and Wales have fifteen times as large a population (45,000,000) as Eire (less than 3,000,000) and a very high proportion of it resides in large cities, which is more conducive to crime, yet they have (even including naturalized Irish, Poles and Italians) only ten times as much indictable crime as Eire (average for Eire in the last four years, 13,000 with "considerable increase" in 1951) less than 4 times as much non-indictable crime, and only five times as many persons in prison.

The population of England and Wales has steadily increased year by year while the population of Eire has slightly decreased. Birth-control is severely forbidden, but there has been so much migration annually that the population still decreases. Yet the volume of crime has greatly *increased* ever since "the trouble" (with England) ended and Ireland became an enclosed garden for the priests. Serious or indictable crime was 7091 in 1927; 13,108 in 1941; 15,329 in 1947; 12,231 in 1950 and 14,200 in 1951. Sexual offences were 168 in 1927; 239 in 1941; 275 in 1950 and 200 in 1951. Juvenile delinquents doubled in number (1605 to 3350) from 1936 to 1942, when, in spite of the demoralization caused by the war, they increased by only 50 per cent in England and Wales. The authorities explain that they made a change in the reports of juvenile delinquents and give only the number of juveniles charged with "certain offences." As these are stated, we see that they now give only the number of juveniles charged with the less grave *indictable* crimes (chiefly theft) yet the number of these has risen to 2,702 in 1951. In England juvenile delinquents of *all* types of offence have risen only to 65,000 in the present demoralizing conditions; and chiefly in its Irish-Catholic cities in the north.

I have drawn attention to the increase in sex-crimes in particular because apologists have successfully inoculated millions with the belief that, whatever offences against property their poverty may induce the Irish to commit—a preposterous suggestion, especially in a mainly rural community—they have a profound concern about the chastity of their women and the sexual law of their Church, which puts sexual offences on the same moral level as murder. Both are punished with eternal torment. I have before me a leading article

which appeared in the *Irish Times* on June 12, 1937. It appears that some weeks earlier a bold medical officer had publicly declared that the increase of lunacy in Ireland was due to an increase of drinking and smoking on the part of the women. The clergy made a violent protest and had the words deleted from his report. "Now, unhappily," says the *Irish Times*, "a condition of affairs has come to light which puts the doctor's modest allegations in the shade."

A few days earlier Judge E. J. McElligot, presiding at the Clare Circuit Court (in the heart of Catholic Eire, the "Banner County," not in more or less cosmopolitan Dublin) found that of the 11 cases he had to try 7 were charges of indecent assault on girls under 17 and one of concealing the birth of an illegitimate child. From the bench he boldly urged that, instead of sending missionaries abroad, the clergy ought to "take stock of themselves and see what they could do to improve their own moral relations." The editorial warmly supported him and rebuked "the pharisaical attitude of the Irish toward the other peoples of the world," especially England. It was "hypocritical" and "preposterous" to talk about sending "innocent Irish girls" to the temptations of English cities. Unchastity, it added, was not the only vice in Ireland, and County Clare was "neither better nor worse" than the other parts of Ireland.

I have already said that the well-known Liverpool priest Mgr. Nugent, repeatedly complained in the last century (*Catholic Times*, November 12, 1886, July 16 and 23, 1897, etc.) that Irish girls in trouble were sent to Liverpool for delivery and that they were "nine out of ten" of the city's numerous prostitutes. The *Dublin Catholic* (March 1895) supported him in an article on "Catholic Morality in Liverpool," saying that "of the three great divisions in that gloomy host—thieving, harlotry, and intemperance—the majority are members of our (Catholic) community . . . and the heavy proportion of this wickedness is assignable to our own countrymen, the Irish Catholics." The same complaint came from Glasgow, Newcastle, Manchester and other Catholic cities. *The Scotsman* (March 28, 1907) quoted the Procurator-Fiscal complaining in court that in the course of the year 20 Irish young women had come to have their illegitimate children in Glasgow. Mrs. Mary Ellison, a London Probation Officer and a Catholic in her book *Sparks Beneath the Ashes* (1934) exposes the scandal in London, Liverpool, and Glasgow and says that when she raised it for discussion at a Catholic social meeting, the Irish women attacked her. They "did not dispute the facts" she says.

In 1935 the Protestant Press Bureau issued a leaflet which gave these and many other Catholic condemnations of the practice: the Jesuit Father S. Smith (1913), Mrs. Desmond, of the Liverpool Catholic Aid Society (1925), Mrs. Cranford, Catholic Councillor of Newcastle (1911), Canon Fortune, Father Columba (*Tablet*, 1926), etc. Definite and exact references to Catholic papers are

given for each of these quotations. It has been a notorious scandal to English Catholics for 60 or 70 years. And it is the same in America. Dr. Sanger (*History of Prostitution*, last edition 1919) personally interrogated 2,000 New York prostitutes. Of these 977 professed to be Catholics and 706 of them had been born in Ireland.

It is unnecessary to explain why I add this unpleasant picture to my account of the growth of crime in Eire since it severed itself completely from England and became a clerical paradise. Catholic teaching puts unchastity on the same moral level as the gravest crimes, yet here, where it has the finest opportunity in the modern world to exert whatever moral influence it has we find a remarkable failure. For the American or English Catholic apologist to urge us to judge the Church by its actions in Italy and Spain is bad enough, for there is more crime and sexual looseness there than in Eire. It is worse when he, occasionally, refers us to Eire. Unless it be Portugal, to the unfortunate condition of which I return later, no other country of our time is so solidly Catholic as Eire and so carefully shielded from modern literature. Here, if anywhere, we have a clear test of the moral and social efficacy of Catholic teaching and training. The country's own criminal statistics condemn it.

CHAPTER VI

The Remarkable Lesson of France

Paris and the larger cities of France have for more than a century had a reputation in England for a moral laxity which the Church of Rome professes to be more eager to check, and more successful in checking, than any other agency, yet the fiction is repeated annually in our reference-books that the majority of the French are Catholics. I have never encountered any apologetic work in which this paradox is explained. At the most we read occasionally the concession that Catholicism was until modern times the creed of the great majority of Frenchmen, but the wave of materialism and license that washed over Europe in the last century weakened the moral fibre of its middle-class and its literary idols (Zola, Daudet, Baudelaire, Gautier, etc.), and upon this has come the devastating wave of Socialism and Communism that has demoralized the workers.

The student of history who knows the moral complexion of France in earlier ages will smile, but for the general public this is one of those melodramatic fictions which Catholic apologists have substituted for history and, unhappily, induced so many writers of history to accept. The real religious history of France is profoundly interesting in its relation to the national character. Historians know how near France came to joining Germany and England in the Reformation, and it was more the moral looseness of priests and people and the austerity of the Huguenots than an attachment to the mediaeval faith that reduced Protestantism to such proportions that it could be crushed by violence and massacre. At the Great Revolution, again, the majority of the people lightly shook off their allegiance to the Pope—Professor Aulard, the highest authority, wonders if they had had any deep religious conviction—and once more, from 1820 to 1870, the Catholic creed had to be re-imposed upon them.

As far as our present enquiry is concerned I take up the story between 1870 and 1880. Even in the forties the Church had fallen so low in Paris that one of the most zealous of the bishops says that you rarely saw a young man enter a church. However, Napoleon III, though he was personally as sceptical as Napoleon I, found it politic to support the Church, and even when he was deposed in 1871 the economic menace of the Communards drove the middle-class back to the Church, just as the menace of the Communists has done in our time. For five years or so the Church had its last spell of power until recent years. In the Chamber more than 500 deputies sat on the Right and only half as many on the Left. The President was the

last Catholic President of France, and extraordinary measures in favour of the Church were passed. Of the 36,000,000 citizens of France 30,000,000 declared themselves Catholics. As we have seen in recent years, baptism by gold is even more effective than baptism by water. But the Church blundered pitifully in its arrogance, under the lead of Leo XIII, and by 1880 its power was waning fast. The Church was dis-established, the monks "despoiled", the whole school-system secularised. When Taine made a severe enquiry in 1894 he found that there were only seven or eight million Catholics left in France.

Now here we obviously have a fine opportunity to test the validity of the Church's boast that it promotes social morality. I need not again raise the question of sexual ideas and practices. Broadly speaking, the Church had never influenced these. But the religious change occurred just in the early period of the collection and publication of criminal statistics, and we eagerly examine the French statistics. And from the figures collected in Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics* one sees at a glance that the growth of scepticism and great reduction of clerical influence in the second part of the nineteenth century was, in spite of the rapid improvement of the police and the growth of population, accompanied by an extraordinary reduction of crime.

In the last period (1830 - 40) of what we might call solid and sincere Catholicism—or the nearest approach to it—convictions for grave crime had averaged 5486 a year. While the clergy deplored the growth of infidelity this figure gradually sank to 3650 in the seventies. Then came the rapid foundering of the Church and the exclusion of all priests and nuns and religious lessons from the schools, and they predicted an orgy of crime, a collapse of the general character, and particularly a rocket-rise of juvenile delinquency. What, in the cold precise language of statistics was the real social result?

We must first realize that the last long period of Catholic domination in France had burdened the Third Republic in its early years with an appalling mass of crime. The French criminologist Lacassagne showed this from the official records in an article in the *Revue Scientifique*, May, 1881. Owing to the improvement of the police-service the most serious crimes had, as I said above, fallen from an average of nearly 6000 a year at the time of the restoration of royalty and the Church to 3000 a year in the seventies; though these figures are complicated in the earlier period by a very large number of political offences and attacks on the Church. Crime generally, or offences against the social order, tripled in France, Lacassagne shows, between 1825 and 1880, the last Catholic period. In the same period the number of boy-criminals quadrupled, the number of girl-criminals went up three-fold, and the number of child-suicides doubled. Convictions for crime of all sorts rose from 13.3 per 1000 of the popula-

tion in 1830 to 29.4 in 1885. The famous psychologist Professor Fouillé repeated these figures in his book *France From the Moral Point of View* (1900).

This was the social situation when, in 1886, the Government completed the secularization of all the schools in the country, substituting civic lessons for the Catholic lessons (commonly given hitherto by priests and nuns) of the earlier regime. The rising curve of juvenile delinquency was at once, and remarkably, reversed. In five years (1889-1894) the number of boy-offenders fell from 4080 to 3582: the number of girl-offenders from 728 to 620. For the next five years we have evidence in the number of children in French reformatory schools. The number of boys dropped from 5023 in 1896 to 3568 in 1901. The number of girls fell from 1095 to 690. The adult prisoners fell from 8771 men and 1088 women to 6097 men and 708 women. For the whole decade (1891 - 1901) following the disestablishment of the Church and the secularization of the schools serious crime fell from 2933 to 2078: middle crime (tried at the Correctional Tribunals) from 216,908 to 188,002: police-court cases from 447,203 to 411,087. Murders decreased from about 500 a year in the earlier part of the century to 200 a year at the end of the century.

The influence of the Church still lingered, you might suggest; or, as W. H. Mallock said at the time, the lamp of France was still burning the oil left from the old sanctuary. In my *Religious Failure to Combat Crime* (1927, one of my American Little Blue Books) I extended the figures over the next decade (1901-10), to give full time for the operation of secular education. Convictions for serious crime continued to fall; from 2078 in 1901 to 1919 in 1911. Convictions in the middle courts fell from 230,000 to 217,623. In the police courts the figure fell from an average of 210,051 (1891 - 1900) to 195,539 (1901 - 10).

These figures, which I gave from the official police *Bulletin* for the first decade of this century are, the compiler indicates, a little misleading. They were inflated in 1904 and 1905 by an epidemic of drunkenness owing to the exceptionally good wine harvest. But this, the writer adds, was "worst in the Departments of Brittany, Normandy, and part of Poitou". These are the most Catholic provinces of France. In these crime rose by, respectively, 6.9, 5.8, and 4.7. The rise in Paris, where hardly one man in 20 goes to Church, was only 1.9. In Paris at that time—and the proportion is probably still much the same—the consumption of alcohol was 4 litres per person; in Catholic Brittany and Normandy it was 12 litres. As in Ireland, the priests were lenient to those conditions and their consequences.

In 1918, after the First World War, and the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, the Roman Catholic body in France was increased by about 1,500,000, while the Protestant opposition gained an acces-

sion of only about a quarter of a million. Apologists abroad rejoiced in the advance of the Church and did not explain that this meant merely that France had recovered Alsace-Lorraine, so that these Catholics were simply removed from the German Catholic body to the French. But the Church gained a great deal more than an increase in members. Alsace and Lorraine did not want to be united either to Germany or to France. They wanted independence, and when the French Government—still a body of “Jews and Atheists”, the Pope said—tried to extend its anti-clerical legislation to them and substituted two French bishops for the German bishops of Strasbourg and Metz, they rebelled. The Pope had, of course, co-operated in the deposition of the German bishops—who were greatly respected in character—yet he immediately, through the local hierarchy, fostered the indignations of the people against the Government.

It was already nervous about the chances of a German war of revenge for the recovery of the provinces and of the great iron and potash beds they contained, and it surrendered to the Church on the usual conditions: the Pope must appease the Catholics of Alsace-Lorraine. He promptly did, and he was further rewarded by having a French ambassador at the Vatican and a Papal ambassador at Paris, for the first time in 50 years. French Freethinkers groaned to see their atheistic President and Premier kneeling in the Cathedral while the Papal ambassador was honoured by the Church. The fifty years struggle of France was over. French policy during the next fourteen years was repeatedly dictated by the Vatican, and the army was put under the command of two generals who lowered its morale and one of whom, Pétain, treacherously betrayed his country when the hour of trial came.

In 1904 I had attended an International Freethought Conference at Paris at which 100,000 Frenchmen marched in procession, chanting insults to the Church. In 1924 I was back for another Conference, and less than 300 attended, while the able statesman who had had the chief part in laicising the schools, Professor Buisson, told me that neither he nor any other statesman would criticize the Church today! The Catholics asserted their new power with great vigour. On January 21, 1928, the chief British Catholic weekly, the *Tablet*, boasted of a “vast network of (Catholic) societies” which they had created. In one diocese “50,000 out of 120,000 electors belong to these Catholic societies, while there are at least 20,000 sympathizers who, for reasons well understood, are not in a position to declare themselves openly”.

In spite of all this more or less secret organization and the craven silence of the anti-clerical statesmen, the Catholics remained out of political power, as they had done since 1880; for the vast majority of Frenchmen were still anti-Catholic. In my *Papacy in Politics Today* (1937) I quoted three French Catholic writers, André Goddard, Georges Goyau, and Denis Gewynn (Anglo-French) ad-

mitting this. There were, they said, not more than 10,000,000 Catholics, probably far less, in the whole population (42,000,000).

The situation is, therefore, very interesting from the point of view of this enquiry, but it is enough to say that this considerable accession of strength to the Church was not followed by a further fall in the statistics of crime. From 1880 to 1914 the "Godless Republic", as the Vatican called it, had, as we saw, been remarkably successful in reducing crime. From 1920 to 1938 the proportion of crime remained fairly constant, and the period ended, as all will remember, with a monstrous crime on the part of the chief representatives of the Church; and the bishops must certainly have been in collusion with the traitors, for the hierarchy at once, and cordially, supported them.

France was surrendered to its deadly enemies, and the Church collaborated with the German authorities as long as they held power. This was the work, chiefly, of Generals Pétain and Weygand, who betrayed the army, Admiral Darlan who surrendered the fleet, and the statesmen Laval and Baudouin: all loyal Catholics and the leaders of the Catholic laity. To a large extent the treason was perpetrated in the interest of the Church.

A book (*Pétain-Laval*) that was published in London in 1942, and for which, I learned, General de Gaulle was responsible, contains a stark exposure of the Catholic plot. For two or three years before the crisis Marshal Pétain was assuring his friends in Paris that France was so corrupt that it could be redeemed (or brought back to the Church) only by defeat and humiliation. He consorted with Hitler's representatives in Spain and was fully aware of Hitler's plan. After the surrender he and his friends created a government at Vichy which worked hand in glove with the Nazis on one hand and the bishops on the other. While the young and naughty Freethinkers, of both sexes, fought and died on the battlefield for their country, this group of leading Catholics aped the luxury and corruption of their German overloads (see Arvan Arenstam's *Tragedy of a Débacle*) and drew the scorn of the world upon France.

This interests us not only as an illustration of the treachery of the Vatican and the moral obliquity of even its most devoted supporters, but on account of the new and larger opportunity which it gave the Church to exert its supposed moral influence. What was the result? The Correctional Tribunals had reported 224,170 crimes and offences in 1940; they reported 417,571 in 1943—a figure that was without precedent in the annals of these courts. The monks and nuns had returned to the schools.

Vichy was obliterated with scorn by the French people when the British and Americans liberated them, but—and it is one of the many tragic symptoms of the disease of our age—the bishops lost not an atom of their prestige and the Pope obtained more power than ever in France. There had, as I said, not been a great Catholic

statesman in France since 1875: not even between the wars. Today the Premier and twelve other members of the French Cabinet are Catholics. They hold all the important posts and rub shoulders in the salons with the cardinals and bishops.

How this extraordinary turn of events came to pass does not concern us here, and I need only recall how the Church at once associated itself with the scare against Communism; and Washington welcomed the ally everywhere. The Vatican, which, in alliance with the feudal monarchs, had bloodily fought democracy until the second half of the last century, now saw in it the greatest opportunity it had had for a hundred years. Dropping the old white and gold banner with the Papal Keys for emblem, it devised banners with strange mottoes on them in every country where there was a large Catholic body, so that the middle-class, its deadly enemies since the days of Voltaire, could join with it in the sacred crusade for freedom and democracy. In France the device on the banner was "Popular Republican Movement".

It is, therefore, impossible to give definite evidence of the numerical strength of Catholicism in France today, and its criminal statistics give us no help in trying to fix the Catholic proportion of the criminal world. Between the two World Wars the electoral statistics helped us, but today, since there is not supposed to be any "Catholic Party" at the polls, we have no means of ascertaining how many non-Catholics vote with the Catholics in the new-fangled, hypocritical bodies; and in France new political sects appear every six months. Socialists, Communists, and (in France) Radical-Socialists are solidly anti-Catholic, and in the last election they cast 45.2 per cent of the votes. But what proportion of the other votes were cast by anti-Catholic Radicals and Liberals who prefer the emblem of the Golden Calf to the Red Flag it is impossible to say. The Vatican's creation, the Popular Republican Movement, lost very heavily from 1946 (when it secured 26.4 of the votes) to 1952 (9.8 of the votes). But General de Gaulle, whose position in regard to the Church is ambiguous, had won most of the seceders. There is no evidence whatever that the number of Catholics—seven or eight million in a population of 42,000,000—has increased.

We can, therefore, merely conclude that the great increase of the *power* of the Church has never led to an improvement of the general character of the nation. It is a myth of the preacher that suffering regenerates an individual or a nation. Crime in France rose by 79 per cent from 1937 to 1942, though the country generally was spared the anguish that fell upon England. In recent years it seems to have continued to increase under the Catholic Government, but I can give the reader only one solid indication of recent developments. The last issue of the *Annuaire Statistique* tells us that in 1939 there were 12,331 men and women in French prisons and that the number in 1945 was 63,051 and in 1946 it was 64,637. This is apart

from the boys and girls (about 1,000) in "Establishments of Supervised Education". England and Wales, with a large population, had about one-third that number of prisoners. Perhaps that will suffice. As in the United States, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, the countries which we know best, Catholic education and Church-influence in France do not, as they boast, check the growth of crime, but positively contribute more than other educative agencies to the criminal section of the community.

Conditions in Belgium are similar to those in France to such an extent that I may briefly discuss it here. "The great majority of the Belgians are Catholics" our works of references, with their fine nonchalance when they come to statistics of religion, continue to tell us. They give to a ton how much bauxite was imported into a country and how much coal was exported, but they are millions astray, year after year, when we ask them about creeds. A few years ago they gave Czecho-Slovakia a total population of 10,500,000 and went on to say that these *included* 10,831,631 (admire the punctiliousness of the unit), Catholics and more than 3,000,000 non-Catholics! In the same year, and on the same page, as they gave the "great majority" of the Belgians as Catholics they observe that in the Chamber of Deputies (after the election of 1936) only 63 Catholic deputies faced 70 Socialist and 23 Liberal deputies; and both Socialists and Liberals were bitterly opposed to them. In point of fact the country has been less than one-half Catholic for decades. Even in 1893, when I studied at Louvain University, my colleagues implored me not to appear in the streets of Brussels in the garb of a monk. It might provoke a small riot.

In the last election (1950) the Socialists, Communists, and Liberals had, collectively, 50.54 per cent of the vote: the Christian Social Party (Catholics and other allies against Socialism) 47.69 per cent. Let us broadly assume that the Catholics are about 40 per cent of the population, but in recent years, as in France, the Government has been Catholic. America prefers Catholic authorities in the West-European countries (Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, Belgian and Western Germany) upon which it depends to form a bulwark against Soviet expansion; in spite of the notorious co-operation of the Vatican only ten years ago with the foulest enemies of freedom and democracy that the world has known in modern times. What is the social result?

According to the *Statistique Criminelle de la Belgique* (1949, the last available issue) crime has greatly increased in the years 1945—9, rising from an average of 30,000 to 35,480. The population is one-fifth that of England and Wales yet it reports 41 murders a year (to the English average of 115), 8762 criminal assaults (6516 in England and Wales), and 8033 sexual offences (14,633 in England and Wales). Considering that genuine Catholics, as distinct from the political followers of the Pope in our time, are about 40 per

cent of the population in Belgium and only about 5 per cent of the population of Great Britain, these figures clearly indicate that Belgium is no exception to the rule that Catholic education and training produce more criminals than secular education does. Juvenile delinquents number 1124. Antwerp, which might be called the Catholic metropolis, has less than twice the population of Brussels, the chief centre of the anti-Catholic elements, yet it has nearly three times as many crimes; and cities like Ghent, with much the same population as Brussels but far more Catholics, have a much worse crime-record than Brussels. Wherever we can test the record of Catholicism in Belgium we find it as bad as in other countries; and if it is claimed that the Catholics number more than 40 per cent of the population, the Church's record is so much the worse.

CHAPTER VII

The Record of Catholic Countries

The Catholic Church was in all ages interested in the wealth of the countries it ruled, since the cream of this wealth went to the priests, the monks, and the Vatican. It was much less interested in what we call today the social welfare, which in so large a measure depends upon the character of the citizens. Its code of conduct was individualistic and in many ways false. It adhered—in theory, for during most of its history the sex-clauses of its code were genially ignored—to the ascetic code which had crept into the West from ancient Persia: the idea that “the flesh” had been created by the supreme devil. Its theologians, therefore, professed to attach enormously more importance to sexual wickedness than to cruelty and theft. In the Middle Ages, it is true, unchastity, cruelty and dishonesty were all three practised as they had never been before, but that is another story. The fact is that there was no social basis for the Church’s moral theory.

The recognition of the social value of good conduct was forced upon the Church by the humanist movement of modern times, and since what it called its intellectual evidences were increasingly depreciated by philosophers and historians, it turned willingly to the idea that virtue pays in this world as well as the next. It implored men to see that the ancient civilizations and—at least in the fairy-tales which it called history—perished owing to the corrosion of their crimes and vices. As a matter of fact, the mediaeval civilization, which survives in the peoples of Europe, is one of the longest-lived of all yet one of the most corrupt; but as usual the Church keeps the faithful by threats and anathemas from reading books in which this is pointed out. However, the social theory of morals prevailed, and the Church appealed to the modern world to see that, whatever its past may have been, whatever may be the weakness of its evidences, it renders a mighty social service by providing, in its schools and ceremonies, the most effective of all agencies for maintaining a high general character.

The only definite test of the average character of a people is to examine its criminal record; just as the only way in which you can measure its general physical health is ascertaining the proportion of disease in it. Hence the importance of the enquiry we are making. The more Catholic a nation is, the less crime we ought to find in it in proportion to the size of its population, if there is any truth at all in the Catholic claim.

We are, therefore, particularly interested in the record of crime in countries which, most folk say, are, or were until recent times, "Catholic". France has not, except for a time in the first half of the nineteenth century, when the Church was able to exert its old murderous pressure on the people, been entitled to that description since the Revolution of 1789, as we saw. Eire is, and pre-war Poland was, definitely Catholic from geographical and political conditions. Italy, Spain, and Portugal are generally described as countries in which the great majority of the people are, and have always been Catholics, so we turn with special interest to the consideration of these.

And I may sum up the results of the enquiry by saying that we shall find that they have, broadly speaking, the highest criminal record, and so the lowest general character, in Europe. The apologist might remind me that I have repeatedly claimed to show that Italy is certainly not a Catholic country in the sense that the majority of the people are Catholics, and that if the savage coercion exercised by Franco and his clergy were removed, we should find Spain no more Catholic than Italy. May not the heavy criminal record, he might ask, be due to the infiltration of "the materialism of the age" and "the spread of infidelity"? But the reply is simple and deadly. Crime and vice were worse in Italy and Spain before, as the Catholic would put it, the wolves got into the fold. The spread of the rebellion against Rome was followed, in strict proportion, by a *reduction* of the heavy criminality which they had inherited from their earlier Catholic phase; and this reduction was precisely due to the rebel writers and anti-clerical Liberal Governments of about 1870 to 1940. I showed this in the first chapter. The Catholic rulers of Italy and Spain today have inherited, and not improved upon, this reduction of crime. The statistics inexorably locate it under Governments which the Papacy anathematised.

It is interesting to glance back for a moment in the case of Italy, because South Italy has been for centuries so obstinate in its mediaeval corruption and still breeds so much crime that one might be tempted to regard it as a regime that is new to the graces of civilization and slow to learn them. But, while everybody knows that Italy was the second country in Europe to rise to a high degree of civilization (the Roman), the fact is that South Italy (from Naples to the tip of Sicily) was the first part of the country to rise to the higher level, because the Greeks had taken it over. It fell into decay when it passed under the Popes, but in a few centuries it was again the most civilized part of Europe, apart from Spain, because it became part of the great Arab-Persian civilization.

After two centuries of brilliant life and culture it passed once more under the Papal yoke and fell into complete degradation. As the Papacy itself was, with a few periods of reform which collectively amounted to only 250 years, corrupt for 800 years (850-1650), it

is absurd to represent it as an elevating influence in those days. That the whole country remained at this low level of character after the Reformation, while Protestant countries steadily rose, I told in the first chapter. Until 1860 the Papal Kingdom was, socially, the most disreputable part of Europe; or, if it had a rival in this respect, it was the Kingdom of Naples, which was just as Catholic and generally despised. In 1870 a secular power took over the whole of Italy and, while the Popes spattered it with ugly epithets, it had, as I showed from the statistics, a remarkable success in the reduction of grave crime.

By the end of the century the "world", which it heavily condemned, had brought the Church of Rome to some sense of its moral-social responsibility, but Italy had ceased to be a Catholic country, and the improvement must clearly be attributed to the excommunicated secular power. In 1904 I attended a world-conference of Free-thinkers in Rome. Ignoring the outburst of Papal anger, the Italian Government granted the visitors a 50 per cent reduction on all Italian railways, and the Municipal Council of Rome granted them the use of the former Jesuit headquarters (the Collegio Romano) and other privileges. Educated Italy was so far lost to the Church that the Minister of Education defied the Papacy and sent the collective congratulations of all the Universities to the hated Professor Haeckel on his 80th birthday. Yet crime continued to fall while the population increased rapidly. At the beginning of the century the total number of grave crimes had been 400,000 a year; by 1919 it was down to 265,493.

In that year, 1919, Fascism began to poison the life of Italy, and crimes of violence increased. Three years later Mussolini's power applied "Fascist efficiency" to the state of the country. He was an atheist, as most of the Old Guard of the party were, but Socialism had made such remarkable progress that he was advised that he could not retain his power without the assistance of the Pope. He therefore "returned to the Church", and in 1929 he bought an alliance with the Vatican for a sum of \$95,000,000 and the independence of the Vatican City.

Church Law was now incorporated in the civil law, and the Pope obtained control of all education in Italy except that given in universities, which flatly refused. Crime then doubled in Italy in the five years *after* the Pope ordered strictly Catholic education in all schools and got criticism of the Church declared a legal offence. In 1933 there had been 507,393 convictions in the courts; in 1937 the number was 897,505. That was the real outcome of a combination of Fascist efficiency and Catholic education. Naturally, no British or American paper dared to draw attention to that grim fact.

During the ten years before the war the Church might complain that the Fascist regime did not fully co-operate with it. The Pope, who was silent when Mussolini scandalously invaded Ethiopia,

Albania, France, and Greece, acridly accused him of violations of the promises he had made to the Vatican. Since, however, the Church was given a free hand in the education of the children he has no excuse. And when, after the war, the Allies—America chiefly—smoothed the way for Catholic statesmen like de Gasperi to secure power—as in other countries the Liberals, who had been bitter enemies of the Church for 100 years, joining the Catholics in their hatred of Communism and Socialism—Italy passed under a completely Catholic Government, with a law that incorporated some of the worst clauses of the Canon Law.

Incidentally, I may point out, this does not make the Italian people more Catholic than before. The Communists and Socialists, both heavily condemned by the Pope, got 37.8 per cent of the votes at the last election, and a further 6.3 per cent went to smaller anti-clerical groups. The Catholics, supported by Liberals to an unknown extent in their disguise as Christian Democrats, got only 48.7 per cent of the votes. They are still less than half the people of Italy.

But it is the size and fluctuation of the criminal record during this steady recovery of power by the Church that interests us here, and I turn to the official *Annuario Statistico Italiano* for its statement of these. It gives us the quinquennial average of crimes and "contraventions" (delinquencies or lighter crimes) from 1921 to 1949. In the decade 1921-5 the number of offences known to the police rose to 1,158,167 a year. In the next five years, when the clergy controlled the schools and the Pope spent vast sums (of his blood-money) on the Italian Church, the figure rose to 1,203,938 a year. It continued to rise until the war—1,341,210—and during the last three years (1947-9) for which figures are available, when the Church has ruled absolutely, the annual average has been 1,367,795.

Of this immense total 862,587 were serious crimes; more than six times as heavy as in England and Wales, which has about the same population. Murders, which had numbered 784 in 1941, were 3312 in 1949. Sexual assaults had been 35,669 in 1941 and were 95,156 in 1949. During four years of Catholic government and clerical control of the schools grave crime has increased fourfold. The "broad-minded" Americans and Englishmen who visit Italy and are so impressed by the monuments and the evidences of its piety will be shocked to hear that, in its official statistics, it is still four or five times as criminal as "godless" England.

And this ignoble record of the Church of Rome in Italy is repeated in Spain and Portugal; to which also we are urged to look for "the real life of the Church". One thousand years ago the greater part of the Iberian Peninsula was occupied by an Arab civilization and was probably the most enlightened and most prosperous area on earth. The Arabs were driven out in a series of brutal "crusades", and at the end of the first century of Catholic control of the entire country the population had sunk from 30,000,000 happy and pros-

perous folk to about 7,000,000 totally illiterate, desperately poor, and highly criminal people.

The French Revolution and the Napoleonic troops had fired a widespread rebellion against the Church, as they had done in Italy, and the reaction after Waterloo had been the same. In Italy, Spain, and Portugal half a million unarmed men and women were sacrificed in forty years in the blood-recovery of power by the Church and the feudal monarchs. We must not offend Catholics by telling these facts in our history books today, and we leave even intelligent people wondering why the dawn of the twentieth century found the Neapolitan and the Sicilian, the Spanish or the Portuguese, peasant so indolent, ignorant, violent, and immoral. We have not, as a rule, the least idea that these folk were the most enlightened and best behaved in Europe just when the English, French, and Germans were in the foulest swamps of the Middle Ages. Church and State had drained the southern lands of their finest stocks 100 to 150 years ago and spared the *lazzaroni* of Naples, the bandits of Sicily, the worst elements of Spain and Portugal.

From 1870 onward, Liberal Governments had given the Spaniards some measure of education, but both their middle-class political parties were so corrupt, just as their Catholic monarchs were, that one year a Madrid paper had been able to steal and publish the results of the general election some days before it took place! Liberals and Conservatives had fabricated the figures in collusion. Liberalism under the lead of writers like Galdos and Ibanez had improved, and Socialism spread so extensively in the present century that in April 1931 the first honest elections had to be granted in Spain. The cities voted in so large a majority (generally 90,000 against 30,000) against the clerical royalist regime that King Alfonso abdicated and fled, and a Liberal-Socialist Republic was established. It is, of course, now represented as Communist, but the Communists were always the smallest—I would almost add, the most respectable political party in Spain. How they effected a social reform, especially in education, which was admired throughout the world, all contemporary writers tell, but the Liberals deserted, the Socialists and Communists quarrelled, and General Franco, with the express blessing of the Vatican and the military and air forces of Italy and Germany, brought the country back under the bloody authority of the Church. At the democratic victory of 1931 there had been no reprisals: Franco's victory was followed by savage reprisals.

For the last ten years General Franco, the ignorant and callous tool of the bishops and the Vatican, has truculently attempted to force the whole nation to return to the Church. Catholic teaching at once flooded all the schools, and shoals of priests and nuns invaded them. On April 16, 1939, when the German-Italian-Portuguese-Moroccan troops had at length compelled the Spanish people, whose solid hostility to the Church had been proved by their re-

sisting this formidable modern "crusade" for nearly three years, the Pope said in a broadcast message to the world:

The nation chosen by God as the principal instrument for the evangelization of the New World and as the impregnable bulwark of the Catholic faith has given the loftiest proof to the champions of the materialistic atheism of our age that above everything stand the eternal values of religion and the spirit."

Even the international press, which had hypocritically supported the invaders—they soon discovered *why* Hitler had exercised his armies in Spain—refrained from comment on this flagrant misrepresentation; though the papers have since been stung into paragraphs occasionally on the state of the new Spain, where the rich and the Church mercilessly exploit the mass of the people.

But at least we have here ideal conditions in which to test the Catholic claim of serving the State by checking crime. To what extent have the ten years of absolute power on the part of the Church reduced crime in Spain? I consult the official statistics issued by Franco's Government in the *Anuario Estadístico de España* (1952) and give in full the figures of offences against the person for the three years before the Catholic Government got to work and during the ten years of their control:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Crimes against the person</i>
1937	14,923
1938	17,180
1939	18,827
1940	29,956
1941	30,582
1942	33,183
1943	34,274
1944	36,617
1945	37,406
1946	36,376
1947	41,755
1948	44,970
1949	48,697

They have tripled the volume of the worst kind of crimes in their twelve years of power. The increase in the number of prisoners in jail is even worse, for the number has been more than trebled:

1934	12,574 prisoners
1940	27,719 "
1947	36,379 "
1948	38,139 "
1949	37,451 "
1950	36,127 "

No paper that had joined in supporting the effort of Franco to

"save the Spanish people from the demoralizing influence of Communism" (a feeble body in Spain) ever brings these significant facts to the notice of its British or American readers. I will add only, in case anybody suggests that perhaps the spirit of evil lingers in Madrid, the great centre of anti-clericalism in the old days, that in these official statistics that city is much less criminal, in proportion to population, than such Catholic cities as Cordova and Seville.

Portugal is much more Catholic than Spain. It is true that in 1910 the Liberals of the few large cities were able to carry a revolution, abolish royalty, and curb the corrupt and wealthy Church, but the Catholics and landowners controlled the mass of the people and recovered power. As reported by U.N., 48.7 per cent of the Portuguese over the age of 10 are still illiterate. Only one other country in Europe, Marshal Tito's Yugoslavia, is so densely ignorant.

Not many years ago I had a very prolific correspondent in provincial Portugal and received whole chapters of realistic description of the life. The country was just an area that had survived unspoiled (from the clerical point of view) from the Middle Ages. The clergy, from the bishop downward, were openly immoral, the noble landowners greedy and callous, the mass of the people pitifully poor, generally illiterate, and steeped in mediaeval superstitions. That is the general condition of Portugal today, outside Lisbon and a few cities. For some years after 1910 the Liberals attempted to raise the people, but the Church and the nobles intrigued against them and inspired a revolt every year until 1930, when they succeeded in capturing the peasant army. Since 1933 the Fascist-Catholic Government of General Carmona and the fanatical Salazar have used every kind of pressure to preserve the people in their virginal innocence. To say, even today, that at least half the people over the age of ten are "literate" is a mockery.

This is the country which the Press represents as our "noble and ancient ally" while it loads Russia, with its splendid record in the reduction of crime and illiteracy, with opprobrium. We will not expect a full record of crime in its scanty statistics, but as far as the figures go they fully confirm my thesis, that the more Catholic a region is the lower you will find the average character. The last edition of the *Anuario Estatístico de Portugal* in the British National Library was published twelve years ago and is incomplete and unreliable except in regard to trade. The population of the country is less than one-sixth that of England and Wales, which the priests represent as a wicked and heretical country, yet the figures of grave crime, poor as the police-force is, are more than six times as great in proportion to population; in some categories far more. They report 109 murders to less than 7,000,000 people (in England 110 to 45,000,000), 110 attempted murders, 17 infanticides (England 6), 13,814 convictions for crimes against the person (in England and Wales 3351).

Sexual looseness is on the same scale. When Byron sailed into Oporto and his wicked eye caught the big statue of the Virgin, he wrote of it in his next poem:

Well do I wot the only virgin there.

The south fringe of Europe, from the Atlantic coast of Portugal to Salonika is the most solidly Catholic (Greek-Catholic east of the Adriatic) part of the continent and the most immoral; particularly in regard to unnatural vice, which is almost the worst sin in the Catholic decalogue. And that beautiful strip of Europe's south coast is the fairest home that it offers to man. Could anyone justly object if we say that it has been blighted by the Catholic religion?

We should next pass to South America, but even if statistics were available the serious student would hesitate to use them. Miss Elizabeth Fry, the famous social worker, writes somewhere that she collected criminal statistics, apparently much as I have done here, and urged the League of Nations either to publish them or collect statistics itself. It refused to do either. It seems that U.N. has been similarly requested, but the representatives of Catholic countries who blocked the proposal to discuss Birth Control would not like the facts disclosed in full.

As a result, when in 1948, U.N. purported to have a section on world statistics of crime in its *Statistical Yearbook*, it had barely one page of statistics, and these were not calculated to hurt the feelings of the Pope. No statistics are published in South America that are useful even to the reader of Spanish or Portuguese.

Another page in the U.N. *Yearbook*, however, escaped the pious censors. It gives a long list of figures of illiteracy from a score of countries, and from this we learn that in the Latin American Republics, apart from Chile and Argentina, which have almost reached the cultural level of Spain and Rumania, from 50 to 70 per cent of the population over the age of 10 are illiterate. We hardly regret that they do not give us any statistics of crime.

This list reminds us that in these countries, which supply at least one-fourth of the Pope's genuine subjects today, one-third are children under the age of 10, and the majority of the remainder are illiterate Indians or half-breeds. In Mexico some years ago an official of the Education Department told me that the great majority of the population were really Indians, and in Yucatan an American lady, who had lived in Merida for 20 years, insisted to me that all the people of the Latin Republic are *mestizos* or half-breeds.

It would be useless to look for correct figures or a scientific analysis of crime in this dark world, but it forcibly reminds us that when the Catholic writer says that the Pope has 400,000,000 subjects—the real figure is nearer 200,000,000—he is including about 200,000,000 children under the age of 17 and a vast number of completely illiterate or practically illiterate men and women. The autho-

rities of these Catholic countries, in their eagerness to prove literacy, count as literates any man who can laboriously scribble his own name, or slowly read something like "Mary had a little lamb". In any case, as I have explained, the figures comprise all who in their infancy received Catholic baptism, whether or not they later rejected the creed and authority of the Church.

CHAPTER VIII

The Record of Protestant Countries

The old distinction between Catholic and Protestant countries in Europe has a very limited validity in our time. France, which is still generally put in the former category, has, we saw, not more than 10,000,000 Catholics in a total population of 43,000,000. Holland is nearly, Belgium quite, as Catholic as Italy. Switzerland is considerably more than one-third Catholic—far more Catholic than France—and Germany, until 1945, was more than one-third Catholic. On the other hand Catholics are almost as scarce in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden as Protestants are in the Latin south, and it is chiefly in these countries that we may take the total number of crimes and offences and usefully contrast it with the total number in really Catholic countries like Éire and Portugal. We have also, however, important evidence in the crime-statistics of the mixed populations of Germany and Holland.

In the Swiss statistics we find no indications of creed that help us in this enquiry, and as in that country Protestants are less than 60 per cent and Catholics more than 40 per cent of the inhabitants, the sum total of crime yields no lesson. Austria we must omit entirely from our enquiry on account of the hopeless confusion of authorities in that unhappy yet admirable little nation today. It was violently dismembered after the First World War, and between the two wars the Republic was so rent by the struggles of Catholic Fascists (later Nazis) and Socialists that the statistician treads warily.

We may usefully note that in the placid days before 1914, when the power of the Church was undisturbed, the crime-record betrayed the usual Catholic guilt. In 1911 the authorities reported 27,694 crimes and 567,496 misdemeanours. France, with a much larger population and 30 years of secular education, had a lighter record. The fifteen years of Socialist control of Vienna and other cities greatly reduced this record. Even the *Liberal News Chronicle* (February 12, 1935) said of their fine work before the Catholics crushed it:

This Republic, which from 1918 to 1934, a period of 16 years, was a model of democratic government, as close to the ideal Platonist Republic as the world has ever seen, is thus obliterated.

The Catholic Fascists destroyed it, then turned to Hitler and the Nazis and betrayed the unhappy country into a serfdom from which it still suffers.

Germany is so rent and disordered today that we should vainly attempt to investigate these matters in it. In fact the *Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich*, which used to be the finest official annual in Europe, has not been published since 1938, and for some years before that date it had ceased to give the figures which told us the respective responsibility of Catholicism and Protestantism (or the non-Catholic body generally).

The crime-record was heavy, as it is in every country where there is a large Catholic proportion. In 1934, the last year for which I have the figures for the whole Empire, there were 376 murders; three times as many as in Great Britain, though the population of Germany was only 50 per cent higher than that of Britain. And we get some idea of the sectarian distribution of crime in the figures that are given for the leading cities. Munich, the capital of Bavaria and the proudest centre of Catholicism, has three times as much crime as Berlin (96,966 against 35,855), although Berlin has a five times larger population than Munich. Dresden, the capital of Saxony and second most Catholic city, has more crime than Berlin yet one-seventh of its population. Solidly Catholic, Bavaria had 59,815 convictions for crime in 1950 to a population of 9,000,000.

But the facts are more clearly stated in the *Jahrbuch* for earlier years. During the first World War it became the practice, strongly encouraged by Catholic writers, to blame the outbreak on the criminality of the Prussian character, because Prussia and Berlin are overwhelmingly non-Catholic. I showed from the *Jahrbuch* at the time that this is an entirely false estimate, and I will be content to reproduce here what I wrote:

Catholic Bavaria and Baden have twice as many sex-offences, and Bavaria has twice as many murders and serious assaults, as Prussia . . . the Catholics are 36 per cent of the total population but 42 per cent (they stated in the *Jahrbuch*) of the criminals. Of 93 murders no less than 58 are by Catholics and more than half the men convicted of "dangerous wounding" are Catholics. Cases of incest are far more common among Catholics, and they have more than their share of all kinds of sex-offences.

In a later issue of the official annual I find crime distributed over the various provinces with the percentage of each. The Catholic provinces—in another section the religious statistics of each are given—have always a higher percentage of grave crime than the percentage for the entire country.

In my *Papacy in Politics Today* (5th edition, 1951) I give details of an appalling exposure of sex-crime in the monasteries of the Catholic provinces in 1936-1938. It is even more deadly than the above figures. In the Westphalian province of the Franciscan monks (about 400 priests and lay-brothers) 276 were convicted in the Catholic courts, the Catholic papers of Western Germany fully agree-

ing, of unnatural vice and seduction of minors; and they received sentences of one to five years in the common jail. Of the remainder 61 confessed their guilt by flight, as Catholic officials had warned them in time. The investigation passed on to other parts of Germany and many hundred more priests and brothers (and some nuns) were convicted, until in 1937, Hitler, knowing that he must conciliate the Pope in order to have his support in his criminal aggression, stopped the prosecutions. To a great extent these were monks in charge of Catholic schools and other institutions, and evidence was given that this was the chronic condition of the monasteries. Indeed, Catholics of the district told friends of mine that they had long suspected it.

It will surprise many to read that Holland is more Catholic than Germany. We teach history today in such a sterile and tedious fashion that few remember, if they had ever learned, that the Netherlands were, in the Middle Ages, long under the rule of the most fanatical Kings of Spain. In point of fact of the 10,000,000 people of Holland today 4,250,289 are Protestants, 3,703,526 Catholics, and 1,641,214 of no religion; and the Catholics have the highest percentage of criminals, the Protestants less, and the freethinkers least of all. This was first exposed by Professor Bongers in 1916 in, as I said in the preface, one of the only two books in any language that ever treated statistically, though for a single country, the question of crime and religion (*Geloof en Misdaad*). Professor Bongers investigated 126,000 cases and found that Protestant criminals were 308 per 100,000 of the population, and Catholics 416. He applies his analysis to every class of crime but it will be enough here to give the percentage for the graver crimes:

	Protestants	Catholics	Jews	No Religion
Murder	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.1
Grave Assaults	8.4	11.9	3.9	1.9
Rape	1.5	2.2	1.5	0.7
Other sex crimes	5.1	7.1	4.1	1.6

In the 35 years since this severe analysis was published the respective shares of the guilt for crime have certainly not changed in favour of Catholicism, in spite of various announcements of reforms. In virtue of their high birth-rate the Catholic ratio of the population has increased a little, and apart from the war-years, when lighter crimes (theft, etc.) shot up alarmingly, there has been a large increase all round. In the latest edition of the official *Criminele Statistiek* we read that offences were 24.9 per 10,000 in 1939 and 44.2 per 10,000 in 1949: murders have increased from 3 a year to 29, and sexual offences from 838 to 1261. The total number of offences is high (291,246) for a population of 9,000,000.

This excellent statistical annual further enables us to see that the Catholic share of the crime is still excessive. It gives us the following figures of the proportion, per 10,000 of the members of each

Church, in the criminal population, as regards the more serious crimes:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Protestants</i>	<i>Catholics</i>	<i>Jews</i>	<i>No Religion</i>
1946	377.8	485.1	371.1	298.6
1947	376.1	469.2	385.5	360.1
1948	385.8	477.2	628.9	360.7
1949	330.6	416.1	570.2	315.2

It is unfortunate that the compilers of the statistics do not offer us some explanation of the abrupt and remarkable rise of the Jewish figures of criminality in 1948 and 1949, and I have not been able to see any later edition of the annual. In all such statistics we find considerable fluctuations in consecutive years, and the figures for 1946 and 1947 put the Jews in the same favourable position, in regard to crime, as we have found in all countries where the four groups are distinguished.

However, this does not affect the thesis which I am here establishing. Not in a particular year but consistently from the year of Professor Bongers's enquiry, 1916, to date the Catholic proportion of the criminals is far higher than the others, whereas, on the Catholic theory it ought to be far lower. And here there is no opportunity to make the excuse of poverty. South Holland is at least as prosperous as the north, and it is in the southern provinces of Limburg and North Brabant that the Catholic population is thickest. The statistics show that these are also the most criminal provinces, and that other provinces in which Catholics form a high proportion of the inhabitants have a corresponding degree of criminality, particularly in regard to offences against the person, which more clearly indicate a defect of character than do offences against property.

When we proceed further north we come to the solidly Protestant countries. Denmark, Norway, and Sweden were united under one crown at the time of the Reformation, and their King was the ablest champion of the Lutheran revolt against the Spaniards and the German Catholic princes; and since the colder and, until recently, poorer north had no attraction for the Catholic immigrants who swarmed over the world from southern lands in the nineteenth century, the three kingdoms have remained wholly Protestant. It is enough here, therefore, to compare the total criminal record of each country, considered in proportion to the size of the population of each, with the total record of Catholic or largely Catholic countries.

In Sweden the Catholic body is 4818 in a total population of 7,046,920, and we may entirely ignore it; and Sweden is, notoriously, one of the cleanest, most peaceful, and most progressive nations in Europe. Its statistical annual (*Statistik Årsbok*, 1951) is admirable, and it shows a remarkable record of the decrease of crime when there was an increase in nearly all other countries. Convictions for crime

fell in it from 50,558 in 1946 to 45,642 in 1949; and if the total still seems large we must notice that it includes more than 30,000 prosecutions for "Violation of public order", which must cover a vast amount of what elsewhere would be considered lighter offences. Misdemeanours fell in the same period from 108,694 to 77,206. Juvenile delinquents (aged 15 - 18) fell from 601 to 441: sexual offences from 475 to 291. Wilful murder increased from 8 to 14, but the number is so small—one of the smallest in the world in proportion to population—that a rise of 3 in 1947 and a further rise of 3 in the following year has no significance for the general average of character. The massive testimony of the larger figures prevents anybody from claiming that. The increase is one of those fluctuations that we find at times in all sets of statistics.

The figures which I have given for the various groups are, class by class and in proportion to population, the lowest in the world, and the lesson they teach us is fully confirmed by the number of prisoners in Swedish penal establishments; and the number of prisoners is, as I explained, one of the best indications of the volume of major crime in any country. In 1950 this number was 2416, or only 3 per 10,000 of the population. The Population of Sweden is, roundly, one-sixth of that of France and Italy, yet each has about 20 times more prisoners than Sweden. Spain, with a four times larger population than Sweden, has sixteen times more criminals in its jails. America has 20 times the population but 65 times the criminals in its jails. Solidly Catholic—Portugal has a not much larger population but, on the latest available statistics, about ten times as many murders a year.

Still in the frozen north as far as Catholicism is concerned and free from invasion from Eire, Italy, and Poland, is Norway. It has less than 500 Catholics in a total population of a little over 3,000,000. Since Eire has a population of almost 3,000,000 we have here the material for a direct and simple comparison of a solidly-Protestant and a solidly-Catholic country. And it is deadly to the Catholic claim.

The Norwegian annual (the *Statistiske Oversikter*, 1948) reports the figure of indictable crime in 1946 (the last available) as 4850, or an average of 4429 for the three years 1944-6. The Irish *Statistical Abstract* gives the total of indictable crime in that country in the latest available year as 12,231. Misdemeanours or minor offences were, in Norway, 48,552 (including a large number of violations of rationing and drink laws that are absent from Eire) and in Eire 147,582. Juvenile delinquents fell in Norway from 1962 in 1943 to 1281 in 1946. In Eire they were 2614 (dropping to 2453 in 1950), and the classification of the Irish offences makes it plain that these are only the offences against property. The Norwegian annual does not enable me to carry through the comparison in all classes of crime, but these figures amply suffice to prove my thesis.

CHAPTER IX

Beyond the Iron Curtain

It would not only be deeply interesting but scientifically valuable to crown this enquiry by an account of the crime situation in those countries (Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary) which have paralyzed the activity of the Roman Church and seen vast secessions from its membership, and in the Soviet Union, where education has been strictly secular for more than thirty years. In the case of the three countries I have named the shortness of the period since the new system of education was created and the effects of war-demoralization make it difficult for us to present a quite satisfactory comparison with Catholic countries in which there has been no such disturbance. In fact, statistics of crime now become scanty, and such as are published do not easily find their way to the English reader. I have been throughout dependent upon the National (British Museum) library, one of the finest in the world but of late years restricted in the purchase of foreign publications and always painfully slow in making them available to readers. In the case of western countries it has mattered little that the statistics I give were in some cases a few years old, but when we cannot quote statistics for eastern countries later than 1946—if at all—we do not see the full effect of the new system of education on character which began in 1946 or later.

This is not to suggest that the British National Library also has erected an Iron Curtain. It has in the last six years imported hundreds of books on social life and recent history from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, but, unfortunately, not one of them has been translated into English; which does not prevent us from continuing to grumble that these churlish folk will not permit us to see how they live and show little interest in how we live. In the case of Hungary, in fact, the difficulty is so great that I must entirely ignore it. All its official publications which are available to me are in Magyar, an Asiatic language which I do not read. I learned to admire them not only in their nineteenth-century history but during a few days in Budapest some years ago, and I do not doubt their progress, but none of their crime-statistics are available to me.

The Czechoslovaks, on the other hand, began immediately after the war to publish in English a neat and valuable *Statistical Digest*. Although the latest issue available to me is dated 1948 and gives the figures of a few years earlier, it affords an admirable idea how the new education is building up character in Soviet Russia and its allies,

because it gives the figures for 1937 for comparison. The Czechs of the central provinces, the main body of the nation, have always been a fine progressive people, and after the First World War they advanced rapidly under the lead of their humanist leader Masaryk, one of the most enlightened statesmen in Europe. They were, however, hampered considerably by the western and eastern wings of the country; the Germans of the Sudeten provinces and the very backward Slovaks of the east. Both were Catholic, and it was they who eventually opened the gates to Hitler, as will be remembered, in 1938 and 1939.

The *Digest* gives us the crime summaries for the prewar year 1937 and for 1945 and 1946; and they are remarkable and do honour to the sturdy Czechs. The figures for 1945, in fact, are so notably lower than those of 1937 that we must suppose that, since 1945 was the year of confusion and liberation, the detection of crime and the administration of law were still gravely disturbed. By 1946 the Socialist-Communist-Liberal coalition which had taken over the administration was functioning vigorously. Religion was free and the clergy were paid by the State, but their influence in education and public life had been effectively checked. The nation had been secularized.

The result, as far as our subject is concerned, was that the Czechs made more progress than any other nation in the world. At a time when crime was increasing almost everywhere else it was surprisingly reduced in Czechoslovakia. In 1937 the number of major crimes had been 37,371; in 1946 the number was 23,238. The number of major and minor crimes or delinquencies put together had been 527,392 in 1937; it was 268,577 in 1946. These figures include juvenile delinquents, but the number of these is then given separately, and we see that the fall in juvenile delinquency in those years of war-demoralization and political disturbance was unique. In 1937 there were 29,986 arrests of juveniles, though there were only 4320 convictions; in 1946 there figures had fallen, in spite of a heavy increase of population, to 11,956 and 1949, or less than half. We saw that in solidly Catholic Eire, which had not suffered the least disturbance during five years of war-convulsions, and whose Catholic education had proceeded as placidly as if it were the planet Mars that was wrapped in the flames, there were more than 2614 convictions for juvenile delinquency, and the official publication acknowledges that this is only the number of less grave major offences. Czechoslovakia, with four times the population of Eire, had far less juvenile delinquents—which means that in proportion to population Eire was at least five times more criminal—and the reduction had been effected just when the influence of the Church had been so checked that the Vatican fumed with indignation.

... Some Catholic apologist may protest that the immense majority of the inhabitants were still Catholics and therefore under the influ-

ence of the Church. We might ask him to explain why, if the Church is to have the credit for this notable reduction of crime, the volume of crime was as bad as in other Catholic countries as long as the Church remained all-powerful and there was so little taint of heresy in the atmosphere, and why it fell rapidly only when a regime which the Pope execrated was set up and the archbishop could be imprisoned in his palace. But we have here a curious illustration of the equivocal methods of the apologist. In the few years before the war our reference books (*Statesman's Year Book, etc.*), which take their figures of religion from the Churches, gave the country 10,831,636 Catholics yet reported that its total population was only 10,500,000, and that about 4,000,000 of the people were *not* Catholics!

This is not the full extent of the arithmetical puzzle. In the same year the Catholic *Tablet* (October 31, 1936) admitted, on the authority of a Czech Catholic, that about 2,000,000 men, including 200 priests, had left the Church since 1920. When the Czechs and Slovaks of 1945 looked back upon the ruin and disgrace that the Sudeten Catholic leader and the Slovak Catholic prelate Tiszo had brought upon their country by inviting Hitler into it, what was likely to be the further number of secessions? The Church has shrunk into a minority and is powerless in Czechoslovakia. To save what is left of it 80 per cent of the priests have taken the oath of loyalty to the very secular government, and the Vatican conspires continuously for its overthrow.

The way in which the Polish bishops have similarly conspired against their Government and the ruthlessness with which it has punished them suggest that the Church there is in the same distressed situation as in Czechoslovakia. The Republic of Poland was established at the Conference of Versailles in 1919—the country had previously been a province of Russia and had had no separate statistics—which scandalously gave the Poles two strictly Russian provinces and one German and added them to Poland proper. How the Poles truculently persecuted these provinces for 20 years in an effort to crush them into the Polish and Catholic mold I have described in my *Papacy in Politics Today*. It is enough here to say that nearly 10,000,000 of the inhabitants of the new Republic were neither Poles nor Catholics.

But the 20,000,000 who *were* subjects of the Pope were the most fanatical Catholics in Europe. Poland was regarded by the Vatican as the most Catholic nation of the modern world. Marshal Pilsudski, originally a skeptic and Socialist, had repudiated his earlier opinions and, like Mussolini, handed over the country to the bishops and the "noble" landowners. The streets of Warsaw witnessed mediaeval religious functions as no other Catholic city did.

And the crime-record of the country during this ideal reign of the bishops, in the 20 years between the two world-wars, was appalling. It published, in English, a *Concise Statistical Year Book* as

naively as if its character *did* bear witness to the claim of holiness of the Catholic Church. In 1936 it reported the total number of crimes and delinquencies known to the police as 778,327 of which 263,188 were offences against the person, 326,061 offences by minors. Of the 526,076 men who were convicted of crime no less than 421,313 were officially described as Roman Catholics; they were less than three-fifths of the population yet four-fifths of the criminals. Of the 68,008 prisoners in the jails (12,000 in England and Wales) 51,308 were Catholics. Murders (110 in England) numbered 1830, for which 1440 persons (40 in England) were found guilty; and there 932 infanticides (less than 20 in England), 1718 attempted murders, and 69,226 prosecutions for drunkenness.

And this immense volume of crime, instead of shrinking as the Church grew in wealth and power, steadily and rapidly rose during the decade before the second war. The prison-population, which is a good indication of the volume of serious crime, rose as follows:

1928	29,796 prisoners
1932	37,992 "
1934	48,444 "
1936	55,336 "
1937	59,496 "
1938	68,008 "
1939	70,520 "

Both the numbers of prisoners in jail and of juvenile delinquents rose by more than 25 per cent in the four years before the German invasion.

Statistics of crime since the close of the war are not available. Even if they were, a comparison with pre-war figures would be difficult, for the two large eastern provinces have returned to their racial unity, the Soviet Union, while a large part of Prussia has been incorporated in the west; nor do we know how many Poles have, like the Czechs and Magyars, seceded from the Roman Church under the new regime. It is enough that from 1918 to 1939 the Church enjoyed ideal conditions for the use of its influence yet we have here one of the most decisive examples of the moral and social futility of that influence. Spain and Italy were at that time causing grave concern at the Vatican by the rise in them of a religious revolt which in Italy, as the electoral results (before the Fascist tyranny was fully established) show, spread to more than half the population and in Spain to at least one-third—the better educated. Portugal and Eire only in the world were as docilely Catholic as Poland was. And in all these countries the volume of crime in proportion to population was much greater than in the Protestant countries, Britain, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, and was expanding more rapidly than in those countries.

What about the Soviet Union? We are not here concerned with the political or economic institutions of that country, and it is a poor type of mind that cannot contemplate the social condition of a country without turning aside to consider other aspects and controversial issues. And in the case of Russia the question of crime is particularly interesting. We are not here concerned, it is true, with the question whether the Roman Catholic minority contributes, in proportion to its numerical strength, more criminals to the community than the Orthodox (Greek) Catholic majority or the atheistic Communists do. The Pope's followers are now too scanty to engage our attention. But for thirty years the entire body of the nation has had its children trained in rigorously secular schools and colleges, and since the almost universal treason of the clergy in the Invasion War of 1918-1919 it has not been lawful to give religious instruction to children under 16 except in the home. Here we have, therefore, a system of moral or social training which the Catholic Church scornfully condemns as inadequate, and it would be supremely instructive to contrast its results with those of the Catholic training.

There are special conditions in the case of Russia which add interest to the enquiry. Under the Tsars neither Church nor State was much concerned about the character of the people, and the general level was one of the lowest in Europe. Moral training was as grossly neglected as in Italy and Spain in their Catholic days, and there was the same thick crop of crime. This was decisively shown, both for the people and the middle class, by Professor Dillon (who taught for years in a Russian university) in his *Russian Characteristics* (1892); and the Russian sociologist and statesman Professor Milyukov said of the book in his *Russia and Its Crisis* (1905): "The general impression he gives is, we must admit, not far from true." Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics* gives us some figures of crime in Russia in the last part of the nineteenth century. They are frightful, yet incomplete, for the police and the administration were then notoriously inefficient.

And upon this morally undisciplined people there now fell a series of calamities that would have demoralized the most sturdy nation. From 1904 onward there was chronic revolt, and the brutal reprisals were especially directed against the college-trained youths and girls, the hope of the nation. In 1910 there were 180,000 of them packed, in appalling conditions, in jails that were built for 107,000, and thousands had been executed. The country still suffered when millions of the workers were taken from field and workshop to take their part, with miserable equipment, in the First World War. In 1917 the urban workers carried two revolutions and set up a Soviet government, but it had hardly begun to organize the chaos when five foreign armies, comprising about half a million of the best trained soldiers, drove upon Moscow from all four frontiers. Two years of famine followed this terrific war, and it was about 1923

before the work of reconstruction seriously began. Such had been the demoralization that homeless orphan children roamed the country in large bands, dead to all consciousness of moral or social law. No less than 540,000 such vagrant children were rounded up by the authorities, and their education had to begin from zero.

We have here a unique opportunity of testing the efficacy of the purely secular system which the Soviet authorities adopted and contrasting it with the results of Catholic education. It is a singular and significant thing that not one of the religious critics of Russia has made the slightest attempt to make this comparison.

It is true that the Soviet Union does not issue criminal statistics in the form with which we are familiar. As I do not read Russian I asked the assistance of the Society for Cultural Relations with the U.S.S.R., and its officials very courteously made an enquiry. They wrote me:

The U.S.S.R. does not publish statistics of crime in a regular way. There are only some scanty and generalized figures for the pre-war period and none at all for the post-war years.

I was not surprised, for from 1923 onward the Soviet authorities have acted on a new and strictly scientific conception of crime. They treat it as a morbid condition, quite analogous to bodily disease, and hold that no treatment of it must be used which puts the stigma of disgrace or degradation for life on the criminal.

We have not only learned and appreciative works on Russian law and its administration by British and American legists but a number of popular works on the prison life by sympathetic visitors like Zenka von Koerber's *Socialist Russia Fights Crime* (English translation 1934) and Corliss Lamont's very reliable little account of his experiences in Russia. These realistic descriptions of what the authors saw of ordinary prison life in Russia help us to understand that country's humanitarian war on crime and its remarkable success, as well as the indifference of the authorities to the publication of statistics.

But between the wars the Soviet authorities certainly collected statistics of crime, and valuable indications of these were given by the eminent Russian jurist Vishinsky in his booklet *Crime Recedes in the U.S.S.R.* (1939), which is now included in *The U.S.S.R. Speaks for Itself* (1941, Vol. III, "Democracy in Practice"). I had already seen this, but it will be convenient to reproduce the summary sent me by the Society for Cultural Relations:

If we take the number of criminal cases handled by the Procurator's office in 1922-23, when the first Soviet Criminal Code was published, as 100, we find a considerable drop in the index for the succeeding years. Thus in 1926 the index figure was 63; in 1929 it was 60.

Of great interest are the changes in the total of crime. Here we find a reduction of 52.1 per cent for the R.S.F.S.R. during the last quinquennial period (1933-37). For the whole U.S.S.R. there was a reduction of 28 per cent during the last triennial period (1935-8).

Statistical changes in juvenile delinquency deserve special note. If we take as 100 the number of convictions in 1935 of juveniles from 12 to 18 years of age inclusive, we obtain the following comparisons:

1936 (first half)	102.3
1936 (second half)	83.6
1937 (first half)	75.2

Other facts which we read in this little work of Vishinsky, who was Procurator or Chief Justice for many years and is a jurist of international repute, are that from 1874 to 1894—the period when Britain, France, and Italy enormously reduced their legacy of crime—offences against the person rose by 55 per cent in Tsarist Russia, rape by 150 per cent, murders by 50 per cent. And the S.C.R. apprises me that in an article in *Social Legislation* (1945, No. 5) Vishinsky writes that “the number of condemned minors of ages 12 to 18 showed a 50 per cent decrease in 1940 as compared with the number in 1931”.

Vishinsky also gives an account of court-scenes in Russia to which one does not find a parallel in any other country. Such is the effect of the education in the purely social nature of offences that it was a common occurrence for an offender to present himself voluntarily in court, confess to having acted “unsocially”, and ask for sentence. In April 1937 there were, the Chief Justice says, 600 of these cases in Moscow. Instead of being sent to jail 530 of these thieves, etc., were placed in employment and they made good. Another unique feature is the “comrades court” that is set up in the large workshops or blocks of flats to try minor irregularities of social conduct and, perhaps, impose a small fine (for quarrelling, slacking, drunkenness, etc.)

Miss Koerber gives a few further statistics in her book, and all have the same lesson. She reminds us that until 1929 the peasants, the majority of the nation, had grievances against the Moscow Government. In that year it created the collective farms, and in a few years won the allegiance of the great mass of them, and there was a more rapid reduction of crime.

The plea is sometimes heard that the Government rules by terror and that this explains much of the reduction. An official of the British Moscow embassy, speaking on the radio in October (1952), was confronted by journalists with the very common statement that the visitor to Moscow is impressed by the look of fear on the faces of the people. He emphatically denied this, adding that “the

young are enthusiastic Communists and the older are not politically-minded but deeply grateful to Stalin and his colleagues".

One of Lord Beaverbrook's most virulent anti-Red journalists, John Gordon was sent to Moscow in the summer of 1953, presumably to get more ingredients for poison-gas. He was remarkably impressed and had the courage to say so in his articles in the *Sunday Express*. Meeting the common belief that "the great mass of the Russians are seething with a desire to throw off their oppression" he says "they don't think that way at all", and "their view that Soviet Russia is a Paradise is the right one—from their practical experience". "The achievements of the Russians in 35 years," he says, "are without parallel in history. They are intensely proud of them".

Thus the "godless" system of education and character-building, which Catholic writers and prelates so scorchingly denounce, has, although it had a far more formidable task than any other system in the modern world, scored a victory over crime and irregularity of conduct which is unique in its magnitude. All recent visitors to the Soviet Union admit that the young have a finer and more generous treatment than in any other country. If they make any criticism it is that in school they are serious to the verge of solemnity. I fancy that most American teachers will envy the Soviet teachers. But these critics do not mention the Soviet system outside school-hours; the parks, theatres, holiday-camps, etc., for children alone. The social result is unchallengeable, whatever one may think of the rigorous training of the children in Communism. The Soviet authorities apply science alone to the rectification of behaviour, and it throws into deeper shade the failure of the Catholic system.

This glance at the effect on social conduct of a purely secular education not only completes but crowns the investigation which I undertook. Our contrast of a few solidly-Protestant countries with the few countries that remain solidly-Catholic was significant enough, but the objection might be raised that these are countries with small populations. In this chapter, on the contrary, we have surveyed the social life of nearly one-fifth of the race. And the indisputable lesson of this survey clinches the truth which we gathered from our analysis of the crime statistics of the remaining Christian states of the world. In each case in which criminals and juvenile delinquents were classified as Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, or "no religion" (or coming from public secular schools) we found that the fourth or Secularist category furnished, in proportion to the size of their body, the least number of delinquents. In all cases, without a single exception, the Catholics were the worst. That is a conclusion that ought to be of vital interest to criminologists, sociologists, and educationists, yet in the last fifty years of a monstrous literary output not one of them in any country has made this factual investigation.

Broadly speaking, this singular neglect of an urgent piece of scientific research is due to intimidation by Catholic authorities.

They are the noisiest and most raucous in their denunciation of secular education, yet not only have they never produced a single set of figures to justify their claim, but the world-figures consistently and most emphatically discredit it and prove the value of secular education. And this cannot surprise any man who approaches the problem without fear or prejudice. Crime is unsocial conduct. The only sure way to check the development of the seeds of such defiance of the community is to educate patiently and thoroughly in a code of social conduct that is based solely upon social motives. Any other code might appeal to the more sincere believers in its doctrinal basis, but in our mixed and challenging world such belief is much more easily shaken than in the Middle Ages; and even that period was, as I have repeatedly shown, more criminal than the world is today. But let us avoid speculation when abundant facts are available. Secular codes of conduct are condemned by the official statements of fact all the world over.

This applies most strongly to the Roman Catholic system. And again no candid inquirer can be surprised. The bases of the Catholic code are a group of ancient superstitions which modern thought has outgrown, and the code itself, partly on this account and partly because a good deal of it is simply in the interest of the power of the clergy, is unnatural and condemned by the modern science of ethics. It, in the light of its ancient lamps, regards the "sin" of the individual, not the social consequences of his acts, and there is no reason to stigmatise the act as "sin" in vast numbers of cases except an ancient myth about "the flesh and the Devil". In the huge 1660-page manual from which I once learned moral theology, a wide range of the most innocent sex-acts are put on the level of murder (incurring hell), while only one paragraph is devoted to cruelty, one of the worst of vices, and it is regarded very leniently. Reading a critical work—this book, for instance—is put on a level with rape. The system never did work, from the second century to the twentieth, with the general social body; and it is not in the least likely to work in our age of diffused skepticism.

Yet the singular power of the Church in our time is based upon the fiction that the system *does* work, and works better than any other. Statesmen who grant the Church this power act upon—not really caring a cent whether it is true or not—the fiction that Catholic education, in school or church, is socially the most valuable of all. Their attitude is profoundly cynical when in our own day they have seen the Catholic authorities co-operate brazenly with Fascism, Nazism, and the Japanese, and now see them—in fact patronize them just on this account—doing their utmost to provoke a Third World War. The late Mr. H. G. Wells had this in mind when a few years ago he declared the Church of Rome to be "the greatest evil in the world today." From this factual examination of the results of its activity in twenty countries we see that in one very important sense his severe language was justified.